

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that the two upper stories will not be disturbed, and instead of the space of twenty days that has heretofore been suggested, the committee of arrangements state that they will ask for only eight consecutive days, two of those being Sundays, so that the employees on the first floor will lose only a week.

Mr. TELLER. If two stories are not to be occupied for this purpose, there will be plenty of room in the Pension Office for storing the papers.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE NEAR ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 23866) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge between Fort Snelling Reservation and St. Paul, Minn.," approved March 17, 1906.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

It proposes to amend section 9 of the act so as to read:

Sec. 9. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be commenced within one year and completed within four years from the date hereof.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I now insist on my motion for an executive session.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 13, 1909.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

William H. Robertson, of Virginia, to be consul-general of the United States of class 6 at Tangier, Morocco.

CONSUL.

Herbert R. Wright, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States of class 9 at Puerto Cabello, Venezuela.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Henry K. Love, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the district of Alaska, division No. 3.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William M. Enright, of Billings, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Billings, Mont.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Harvey E. Berkstresser to be postmaster at Dadeville, Ala.
Sylvanus L. Sherrill to be postmaster at Hartsells, Ala.

ARIZONA.

W. Weiss to be postmaster at Clifton, Ariz.

ARKANSAS.

J. E. Woodson to be postmaster at Hope, Ark.

FLORIDA.

F. A. Florence to be postmaster at Paxton, Fla.
William Clarence Smith to be postmaster at Daytona, Fla.
Louis Wiselogel to be postmaster at Marianna, Fla.

IDAHO.

Joseph R. Collins to be postmaster at Moscow, Idaho.

INDIANA.

Louis T. Bell to be postmaster at Flora, Ind.
Joseph E. Gordon to be postmaster at Versailles, Ind.
Charles Fremont Hoover to be postmaster at Akron, Ind.
Charles McGaughey to be postmaster at Roachdale, Ind.
Howard H. Newby to be postmaster at Sheridan, Ind.
John R. Nordyke to be postmaster at Wolcott, Ind.
Knode D. Porter to be postmaster at Hagerstown, Ind.
William E. Sholty to be postmaster at Windfall, Ind.
Frank D. Walters to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ind.

MISSISSIPPI.

Lillie W. Nugent to be postmaster at Rosedale, Miss.

NEW JERSEY.

Isalah Apgar to be postmaster at Califon, N. J.
Alfred B. Gibb to be postmaster at Bernardsville, N. J.
Uzal S. Hancy to be postmaster at Franklin Furnace, N. J.
Howard V. Locke to be postmaster at Swedesboro, N. J.
Charles W. Russell to be postmaster at New Brunswick, N. J.

NEW YORK.

Daniel Smiley to be postmaster at Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
Wallace H. Wells to be postmaster at Brasher Falls, N. Y.

NORTH CAROLINA.

J. Walter Jones to be postmaster at North Wilkesboro, N. C.
Zach Stephenson to be postmaster at Clayton, N. C.

OHIO.

Roscoe G. Hombeck to be postmaster at London, Ohio.
Percy May to be postmaster at New Holland, Ohio.
E. Calvin Miller to be postmaster at New Carlisle, Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Zacharias A. Bowman to be postmaster at Annville, Pa.
Elmer D. Carl to be postmaster at Greencastle, Pa.
Joseph B. Colcord to be postmaster at Port Allegany, Pa.
Frank A. Howe to be postmaster at Waterford, Pa.
Roscoe C. Keefer to be postmaster at Clairton, Pa.
William P. McMasters to be postmaster at Munhall, Pa.

UTAH.

James Clove to be postmaster at Provo, Utah.

ARBITRATIONS.

The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following conventions:

An arbitration convention between the United States and Bolivia, signed at Washington on January 7, 1909. (Ex. J, 60th, 2d.)

An arbitration convention between the United States and Ecuador, signed at Washington on January 7, 1909. (Ex. K, 60th, 2d.)

An arbitration convention between the United States and Haiti, signed at Washington on January 7, 1909. (Ex. L, 60th, 2d.)

An arbitration convention between the United States and Republic of Uruguay, signed at Washington on January 9, 1909. (Ex. M, 60th, 2d.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 13, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Edward Everett Hale.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its secretaries, announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 653) to authorize commissions to issue in the cases of officers of the army retired with increased rank, disagreed to by the House, agreed to the conference asked by the House, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. TALIAFERRO as conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, under the rule, and referred as follows:

S. 7925. An act to create an additional land district in the State of Montana, to be known as the "Harlowton land district"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 7992. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for participation by the United States in an international exposition to be held at Tokyo, Japan, in 1912," approved May 22, 1908—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 7918. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Murray—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 7257. An act providing a means for acquiring title to private holdings in the Sequoia and General Grant national parks in the State of California, in which are big trees and other natural curiosities and wonders—to the Committee on Appropriations.

LINCOLN POSTAGE STAMP.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of House joint resolution 216, which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and to consider the same at this time in the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 216.

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized to design and issue a special postage stamp of the denomination of 2 cents in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does not the department, without asking the consent of Congress, fix stamps?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Missouri that I really believe the Postmaster-General, under existing law, would have authority to do this very thing, although there is naturally some reluctance in issuing a special commemorative stamp on account of the birth of any man in the history of this Republic without the authority of Congress. My friend can easily see what it might lead to in the future if the Postmaster-General, on his own responsibility, designed and issued a memorial stamp to mark the birth of any statesman in the history of the Republic.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is to be a 2-cent stamp?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is he to go on and make it perpetual or just for this year, or what is it?

Mr. DAWSON. This is to be a commemorative stamp. As I understand it, this particular issue of stamps, designed and issued to mark the centenary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, would be a distinctive stamp. A certain number of these stamps would be issued and then that issue cease.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not interfere with the ordinary George Washington stamp?

Mr. DAWSON. Not at all, but I may say for the information of my friend from Missouri and for the information of the House that a probable result will be that in the future the head of Abraham Lincoln will be retained on one of the stamps of the Government, probably the 5-cent issue.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no earthly objection to his picture being on the stamp. I saw a statement in a newspaper not long ago that somebody down there who has authority, or seems to have authority, has issued stamps two or three times with the picture of Abraham Lincoln and then withdrew them. My own opinion about it is that pictures on stamps ought to be of well-known people, so they are hard to counterfeit.

Mr. DAWSON. The head of Lincoln has been on stamps of various issues, some of which have been discontinued.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question. What good will this do, and what will be the expense to the Government?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that I need not advert to the fact that it will be entirely fitting for this Government to mark in a modest way the one hundredth anniversary of the man who had so much to do with the preservation of the Government itself. Lincoln stands out as the typical American, and his rise from obscurity to the very pinnacle of fame is a source of constant inspiration to the youth who come after him. I believe there is a universal desire among the people of the United States that we should mark this centenary.

Mr. MANN. By issuing a stamp?

Mr. DAWSON. Not necessarily. If this proposition has any merit in it at all, it has the merit that it will bring this great event to the mind and attention of every man, woman, and child in the United States, and I know of no other plan which would so successfully accomplish this result.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman doubt that any person in the United States of reading age will know that this is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln?

Mr. DAWSON. Oh, no; but this special 2-cent stamp, the gentleman will agree, will bring the fact in close contact with the daily activities of our people.

Mr. MANN. What will be the expense to the Government—I do not mean in preparing the stamp merely, but in sending out a separate issue of stamps to every post-office in the United States?

Mr. DAWSON. I will say to my friend that I can not answer that question specifically; but by issuing a single 2-cent stamp I understand that the difficulty and additional expense that has heretofore been had in the Post-Office Department with respect to the issue of a series of commemorative stamps will be obvi-

ated, and the necessity of keeping separate accounts will be obviated.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand it that way. I think the accounts will still have to be kept separate for this issue of stamps. It seems to me we ought to have information on that point. It probably would not lie in the mouth of any gentleman in the House to object to a request of this sort. I happen to come from the State from which Abraham Lincoln came, as far as the Presidency is concerned.

Mr. DAWSON. I will say to the gentleman, I had a conference with the Postmaster-General regarding this matter. My original intention was to present a resolution providing for an entire series of stamps. There was an objection to issuing an entire series, for the reason which the gentleman has set forth; but I understood from the Postmaster-General that that objection would be obviated if we authorize simply a 2-cent stamp, which will go out to the postmasters of the country on requisition practically the same as any other 2-cent stamp.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire whether the image of Abraham Lincoln had not been on a 2-cent stamp some twenty years ago?

Mr. DAWSON. My recollection is that the head of Washington has always occupied a permanent place on 2-cent postage stamps since the years of the 2-cent postage.

Mr. KEIFER. I was under the impression—but let me inquire. The resolution seems to provide that the Postmaster-General is authorized to design an issue of special postage stamps of the denomination of 2 cents in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Now, does it contemplate anything else than merely putting on the face of the 2-cent stamp the image of Abraham Lincoln?

Mr. DAWSON. By the terms of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the design of the stamp is left entirely with the Postmaster-General; and my understanding is that by reason of the brief period of time between now and the 12th day of February, when it is desired to have these stamps put on the market, it will consist principally of the head or face of Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

RIGHT OF WAY ACROSS NIOBRARA MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 8143) granting to the Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company a right to change the location of its right of way across the Niobrara Military Reservation.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, which has become the owner of and is engaged in the operation of the railroad constructed by the Fremont, Elkhorn and Missouri Valley Railroad Company across and through the Niobrara Military Reservation, located in the State of Nebraska, under and pursuant to the provisions of an act entitled "An act granting right of way to the Fremont, Elkhorn and Missouri Valley Railroad Company across the Niobrara Military Reservation in the State of Nebraska," which was passed and approved on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1883, is hereby granted the right to change the location of its right of way and of its railroad where they now cross the south half of section 8, township 33 north, range 27 west of the sixth principal meridian, and is hereby granted in place of said right of way granted to the said Fremont, Elkhorn and Missouri Valley Railroad Company by the said act of February 28, 1883, a new right of way not exceeding 400 feet in width, to be so selected as not to interfere with any buildings or improvements on said reservation, and the location thereof to be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, across and through that portion of said military reservation embraced within said south half of section 8, township 33 north, range 27 west of the sixth principal meridian.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, from reading the bill I understand this gives them a title to the right of way across a military reservation. There is no reservation in it by which Congress can hereafter require them to move their road if it should see proper to do so. Is that correct?

Mr. KINKAID. I think the intention is in case of nonuser of right of way it would revert to the Government.

Mr. PAYNE. No; but suppose the Government should want the land and require them to move away, there is nothing in the act which would give the Government that right, is there?

Mr. KINKAID. It is in the usual form, but I, at his request, will defer to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is all subject to the approval of the Secretary of War. They surrender more than twice as much of the reservation as they take. It shortens the road, makes a more direct line, and avoids a very steep grade. It is

in the form that all these bills are in. I suppose the Secretary of War, if the Government needed it, could take it up. It will never be done, however.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know whether they could or not, and I do not know whether the original grant is that way or not. The Government made a grant of a reservation in the city of Oswego, in my own State, reserving the right to cancel the right of way and compel the railroad company to move, and in the last three or four years they have compelled the railroad company at great expense to get a new right of way, because they wanted to use the reservation.

Mr. KINKAID. If the gentleman will permit, I will explain to the gentleman from New York that it has been the intention of the War Department and the administration for some time to have this military reservation abandoned as such. But it has not yet been carried out. It is not now being used as a military reservation, and I regret that the prospects are that it may not be continued as such. The language of the present bill is the same as the language of the original bill, in legal effect, at least, and this bill will require very much less the amount of area than the original bill—about one-half. It removes the right of way further from where the post site exists, and removes it to the edge of the reservation. The purpose of the bill is to give the road an opportunity to construct a new bridge in place of an old wooden bridge 25 years old, and secure a better grade. The present bridge is about 50 feet above the river. The new bridge will be at least 58 feet higher, so that the grade will be improved accordingly. The new bridge will be a first-class steel structure, so that the public will be greatly benefited by the change, and the public in general is therefore concerned in the change.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. What distance across the reservation is asked for in this right of way?

Mr. KINKAID. Twenty-two hundred feet. The distance now occupied by the right of way is three-quarters of a mile, so that the distance is only about one-half, or less than one-half.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Does the gentleman think that it is necessary to give them a right of way 400 feet in width?

Mr. KINKAID. It is, for the peculiar reason that they wish to improve the grade, and the banks of the river are very high, and the grade will be considerable at best. They need this for the purpose of handling dirt, and will have to occupy about all of it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Is it not a fact that that is just about four times the width of an ordinary railroad right of way?

Mr. KINKAID. Oh, yes, it is, sir; but not under such conditions. The right of way under such conditions in many cases is equally great.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. What becomes of the present right of way?

Mr. KINKAID. It reverts to the Government and goes back to the reservation.

Mr. MANN. So that the Government acquires a little more than it gives?

Mr. KINKAID. It acquires somewhat more than it gives; yes.

Mr. PAYNE. In embankments on the present right of way?

Mr. KINKAID. There is some, but not half so great as this will be.

Mr. PAYNE. So that the Government gets improvements by the way of embankments, which, of course, would destroy the commercial value of the property that is given.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to say a word or two on this matter.

Mr. KINKAID. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This right of way is over a section of the country where they have granted to homesteaders 640 acres if they will undertake to live on it. It is a section of country where the land is of comparatively no value, being largely sand hills. They run in on the reservation now and circle around through. This makes a short cut across the reservation. According to the War Department, it is necessary to make the grant 400 feet wide. I raised the point that this was an unusual width to give and ought not to be done, and the War Department in its report says that on account of high embankments and the character of the soil it is claimed that they must have an extra right of way in width.

Now, I regard it as of no value to the Government. It is of great value to the road and to all the people on that line of

road—the town of Valentine and all those settlements up and down the road. At present the road where it approaches this bridge has to make a dip down to the bridge, and a very steep grade to get up to its level again. My information was that it was more than 100 feet from the river bed to the top of this bridge. The gentleman says it is 58 feet.

Mr. KINKAID. Eighty feet to the present bridge, and the new bridge will be 138 feet, making it 58 feet higher.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is one of those cases where they must come to Congress for the privilege of making this great improvement. It requires an outlay of money on the part of the road, but ultimately will be of great benefit to it, I have no doubt.

Now, coming back to the point that the gentleman referred to, in all cases where the Government supposes that it will need the land again, the right to change the location of the road or to vacate the grant is always reserved, but in this case it is an entirely different proposition. The land is of no value, and if open to sale would not bring \$5.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask the gentleman, in connection with that, if the Government gives a right of way to a railroad company, giving them a perpetual easement in land, so that the Government can not afterwards reclaim it unless the railroad abandon the line, why should not the railroad company do as they do with individuals—pay whatever the land is worth?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The land is not in the market. They can not buy it. If they did buy it, they probably would pay about a dollar and a quarter an acre, and all the rest of the land, at a dollar and a quarter an acre, would lie there forever without anybody buying it.

Mr. MANN. It amounts to as much as four or five dollars altogether?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. It is 400 feet in width.

Mr. MANN. And 2,200 feet long.

Mr. PAYNE. My friend here says it is less than a quarter of a mile. That is not according to my arithmetic.

Mr. KINKAID. No, sir; not at all. I said 2,200 feet.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I believe that the grant of this land will benefit all the people of that part of Nebraska and South Dakota; it can not harm anybody, and it will enable the road to make an improvement that is absolutely necessary, in order to do its work as it should be done for the people.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman right here that I am opposed to the Government granting a perpetual right of way over any of its reservations without compensation.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We did it at Fort Reno Reservation.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand from the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] that this grant is in the same language as the original grant, which was for a strip of land about three-quarters of a mile in length and 100 feet wide.

Mr. KINKAID. One hundred and fifty feet.

Mr. PAYNE. We are giving away a good deal more land than we get back; but because of the facts stated I do not care to object to this bill. I do think, however, that the Military Committee should take that into consideration in regard to future grants—that wherever we make a donation to a railroad company, whether it is a dollar or \$10,000, there ought to be a provision in it that the Government at any time may change the route or compel them to move off the reservation. It proved to be of great value to the Government in the city of Oswego that they had that right. They had a chance to sell the land there, as I remember it, and the railroad moved off. They compelled the railroad to move off from the reservation, and at large expense to acquire a right of way, just as in all civilized communities railroad companies are required to get it by paying the owner. They always should pay the owner what the land is worth, whether the United States or an individual is the owner. But as I am assured that the railroad company already have this perpetual right of way in a strip of land not quite so large, and that they need the dirt for filling, 400 feet in width—I hope the gentleman knows that of his own knowledge, because if he does not, I am very much disposed to doubt the assertion that they need so much for an embankment—I will not make an objection this morning. But I want to give warning to the Committee on Military Affairs, if they bring in any bills similar to this without making some provision for payment for the absolute right of way in perpetuity, I shall object hereafter.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to say for the information of the gentleman that the railroad would have been glad to pay for the land, but there was no way they could buy it.

Mr. PAYNE. You could put the permission into this act and allow them to buy it and fix the price.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska who owns this land?

Mr. KINKAID. The Government owns it, because it is a military reservation. The railroad has a right of way over it twice as long as the distance they now ask for, and that will revert to the Government. The Government will get back more than it gives away.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want a little more information. This land does not belong to the Indians?

Mr. KINKAID. No; and never did.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Where is the land situated?

Mr. KINKAID. In northwestern Nebraska, near the South Dakota Sioux Reservation.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has the Speaker approved of it? [Laughter.]

Mr. KINKAID. Oh, yes. [Laughter.] If recognition is approval.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska if he would be willing to accept an amendment to the bill providing that the right to amend, alter, or repeal the act is reserved.

Mr. KINKAID. If that were usual in such cases, and we had some decisions well establishing the law on the question, I would know better how to answer the gentleman; but as the original bill was the same in legal effect and form as this and is a Senate bill and not my own, and inasmuch as the Government will get back more than this will take, I should feel that I ought to say that I could not consent to that, but I would not object, of course, to the railway company being required to pay the reasonable value of the land.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman says the purpose of the bill is to construct a bridge, as I understand it.

Mr. KINKAID. Yes.

Mr. MANN. In every act Congress has passed, and they are frequently passed, providing for the construction of bridges by railways across navigable streams, it is the invariable custom, never departed from, to reserve the right to alter, amend, or repeal the act.

Mr. KINKAID. This is not a navigable stream.

Mr. MANN. It may not be a navigable stream, but it grants authority to build a bridge across the government property. The authority in other cases is granted to build a bridge across property the Government does not own, but here is a proposition to give away property which the Government does own. There is no difference in theory as to the right to alter, amend, or repeal.

Mr. KINKAID. There is a difference in regard to whether it is navigable or not; this is across a military reservation, which may be abandoned.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if that proviso in bills authorizing the building of bridges is not to protect navigation as it developed in the future, so if the bridge becomes an obstruction to navigation in the future it can be taken away?

Mr. MANN. It is in cases where the Government gives a franchise and reserves the right to alter, amend or repeal, and it ought to be done in every bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Let me ask the gentleman if the Secretary of War has approved this bill?

Mr. KINKAID. The Secretary of War has approved of it unqualifiedly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the bill conform to the statute that was passed at the last Congress requiring all bills to conform to a certain form?

Mr. KINKAID. It does not violate any statute at all, and it was acceptable to the Judge-Advocate of the War Department, who is especially well informed on these questions.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. When did the gentleman introduce the bill?

Mr. KINKAID. It is a Senate bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. When was it introduced in the Senate?

Mr. KINKAID. On the 11th of this month. Let me explain. The railroad company wants to get to shoveling dirt right away, because the present bridge, besides being so low and the grade being so great that they have to double team on the west side of the river with extra engines, is 25 years old, a wooden structure, and therefore we do not know that it is entirely safe, and they want to get to throwing dirt, I understand, soon. That is why we are pressing the bill as rapidly as we can.

Mr. MANN. Then, I think the gentleman had better accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object, Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman will accept the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] will yield, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. KINKAID. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is confusing the provisions in legislation granting authority to construct bridges over navigable streams with the usual legislation granting rights of way to construct railways over the public lands. The two cases are not parallel. When a bridge is built over a navigable stream the facilities for navigation must be protected, and it is customary to reserve the right in the Government to amend or modify the franchise as the public needs may require.

On the other hand, it has been the universal policy of the Government from the beginning, so far as I have observed, and I am quite familiar with the subject, to grant the free right of way to railway corporations, and to all companies of a quasi public kind, that will construct railways and highways in the West through all of the public lands, and particularly for the purpose of railway construction. Now, if this right of way were upon any of the public lands except what had been heretofore used as a military or some other reservation, the company would have the absolute right by simply filing a plat with the Secretary of the Interior to modify or change its right of way, and in no case, so far as I am aware, has there ever been insisted upon a provision that a railway company building a railway across the public lands of the United States should be required to submit to a provision that Congress or the Government might at some future time, or at any time, require a modification of the grant.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is evidently mistaken as to the legislation of Congress during the last few years on the subject of rights of way through reservations.

Mr. MARTIN. On the subject of bridges over navigable streams, the gentleman from Illinois is correct, but as to the subject of rights of way for railways over public lands I am sure my recollection is right.

Mr. MANN. I think in every case it is provided that either the Congress or the War Department shall have absolute control over the question of the right of way and the continuance as a right of way.

Mr. MARTIN. The injustice and the impracticability of that sort of a provision in the ordinary construction of a railway in the West will appear, I think, on a moment's reflection. It would be a matter of comparatively little importance to this company or any other company building a railway that it should pay the reasonable value outright for the land used for the right of way. It would be a matter of infinite inconvenience and possible damage if it might be subject to the will of anyone in the future and forced to arbitrarily change its right of way. In this particular instance—

Mr. MANN. The same is true about a railway bridge over a stream.

Mr. MARTIN. Over a navigable stream only, for the reason that there is the purpose of river navigation to be conserved, which is of equal importance with that of railway transportation.

Mr. MANN. It is just as much trouble for the railway to change for one reason or the other, and it has never stopped a railway building a bridge up to date.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have never been aware of any provision of that sort as to any construction of railways over the government lands. Of course we do not grant specifically by Congress provision to build bridges over nonnavigable streams. That goes as a matter of right to the railway, and so there has been no legislation on the subject, except the general legislation granting a right of way. The act of 1875 now upon the statute books gives absolutely over all of the public lands in the United States the right to a railway or other quasi public corporation to construct its railway, whether it is across interior streams or otherwise. I am somewhat familiar with this particular case, as it is a road which I travel over almost invariably in going to and from my home. The circumstances are these: Some twenty-five years ago this railway built its line up through western Nebraska and into the Black Hills country of western South Dakota, in which I live. As is common in the early building of railways, its right of way was more or less circuitous. Now, in the day of more traffic, provision is being made to accommodate these circumstances, and one of the necessary things is the straightening and shortening of this right of way where it runs through these public lands, then in a military reservation.

The road as now constructed through that country makes quite a circle. My own opinion is that in the making of proper abutments and approaches to this high bridge, something over 138 feet, it will probably be necessary to use all or most of the 400 feet asked for that purpose. Now, it is a simple proposition in which a railway with a right of way over that reservation, the reservation being practically abandoned for military purposes, a part in every sense of the great public lands of the United States, desires to straighten its course through that part of the country. It is wild, unused land, of insignificant and nominal value. I am sure the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] could have no great objection to the railway paying the value of it if anybody insisted upon that, but the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I am sure, in the face of a great public improvement of this kind, which will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, would be a very serious modification of the usual custom regarding railway construction in the West.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. If any municipality owned this particular piece of land, would it not be regarded in the light of enlightened public policy in regard to these matters for that municipality to demand such an amendment as is suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, if it were within the corporate limits of a municipality, I can see where there would be occasion for it. Out on the open prairie, in a country where the land about is probably not worth to exceed \$5 per acre, I can not see any real reason for a reservation of this kind.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. If the land belonged to a municipality—never mind whether it is within the corporate limits or is in actual use or there is reasonable expectation it will be in actual use—but if it belongs to a municipality or a private individual and we were giving something for nothing, granting a right, would it not be regarded as proper that this protection which the gentleman suggests, and which as a provision now goes into every franchise and charter that is granted in my State—surely not the most unfriendly State in the Union to corporations—does the gentleman not think that when we are giving something it is only fair that we should safeguard the interests of the Government to the extent suggested by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN. The interests of the Government and the people of the States always should be safeguarded to the fullest limit, and my own opinion on the question which the gentleman asks is this: If the inconvenience to the grantee is out of all commensurate proportion to any possible damage to the grantor, or out of proportion to the value of any grant, I would say that a reservation of that kind would be very unreasonable.

Now, perhaps the value in this grant that is in existence at the present time is \$5 an acre, the acreage is—

A MEMBER. A dollar and a quarter; not over.

Mr. MARTIN. The value in controversy is not worth over \$25.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is not worth \$5.

Mr. MARTIN. I am surely making a liberal estimate of Nebraska land when I say it is not worth over \$25. Now, here is a proposition to a company that will put an improvement on their road of perhaps a half a million dollars that, if they exchange for this purpose a right of way worth \$25, they shall be subject to arbitrary dictation by anybody or somebody at some time which may force them to move or modify some of their work which has cost a half a million dollars. Now, the paying for the land is insignificant, but it is certainly a hardship on the company to put anything in the bill that would force them to be subject to the will of anybody as changing arbitrarily the location of the project, and it would be an infinitely serious matter.

Mr. KINKAID. With the permission of the gentleman from South Dakota I would like to answer further: This is on the outskirts of the reservation; the present right of way is in the interior part. If this reservation were used for a military reservation the Government would never use this part at all. This cuts across just the border of it, and the whole of the reservation is liable to be restored to the public domain and made subject to the homestead laws, so that the Government would no longer be interested in this as a military reservation, and that would remove the foundations entirely of the contention that the Government should reserve any right whatever. If the reservation should be discontinued as a military reservation and made subject to the homestead laws, this change would benefit the homesteaders by giving them more land to homestead, because this takes less right of way.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Now, if the gentleman will permit, my position is this: I do not think it is proper for this House to give any kind of unreserved grant, no matter how

small it may appear to be. It is quite evident that this grant has some value; it is quite evident that somebody wants it and is here asking this House to give it to him. Now, if it be true that the original grant is a perpetual grant, I do not believe it is good policy to make this a perpetual grant so that both grants will be consistent. I think, if the gentleman will permit, that if this amendment will give the Government any advantage, restore it to somewhere near the position that it would have had if the language had been placed in the original grant; if it restores to the hands of the Government any weapon which it never should have relinquished, that it should be adopted. So far as the danger of the Government arbitrarily using this power is concerned, I do not think the gentleman will contend that there is any danger of that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. GARDNER of Michigan, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 25392, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 25392, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and by unanimous consent and agreement reached last evening the first paragraph is in order, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34. Playgrounds: For maintenance and renewal of equipment and planting trees for outdoor playgrounds, \$1,500.

The Clerk read the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS], as follows:

Amend, on page 34, lines 13 and 14, by striking out the words "one thousand five hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen thousand."

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is an amendment which, if adopted, would provide an appropriation of \$15,000 for the maintenance of the playgrounds in the District, as against the \$1,500 which the committee has provided in the bill. Last year the appropriation bill provided only \$1,500 for maintenance; but the maintenance and the grounds cost \$18,000, of which only \$1,500 was contributed by appropriation. The rest of the money was raised by outsiders. Several years ago we started on the policy of school playgrounds and municipal playgrounds. There are now in the District 18 school playgrounds and 13 municipal playgrounds, making in all 31. The contributions last year were raised at—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PARSONS. If the gentleman will excuse me for a moment—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I wish to ask the gentleman a question right there. How much land is there in these playgrounds, and where are the playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. The school playgrounds are some areas immediately surrounding the schools. The municipal playgrounds are scattered all over the District, and vary in extent from about 1 acre to 5 acres.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How many acres are there, all told?

Mr. PARSONS. I can not say exactly. I suppose that the 13 municipal playgrounds altogether comprise about 25 acres.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How many schools are to be supplied?

Mr. PARSONS. There are 18 school playgrounds, but they are very small areas that adjoin the schools. Last year the \$18,000 that was raised for the playgrounds was contributed in this way: In response to letters \$2,000 was raised. They had a tag day, and they raised \$8,260.51. Then they had a river excursion and a baseball game, by which they raised \$378.

Then, in October Mrs. Roosevelt had an entertainment by the Ben Greet players on the White House grounds and raised \$1,932. Then the children who use these playgrounds were allowed to contribute, and they contributed \$3,911, two and one-half times as much as you appropriated. Last year in the appropriation bill there was also appropriated \$5,000 for equipping one of the playgrounds, but the appropriation for maintenance was only \$1,500. The only appropriation this year in connection with the playgrounds is one for maintenance—\$1,500.

The attendance at the playgrounds has increased very largely since they first started, and is continually increasing. Playgrounds are now maintained by over a hundred cities in the United States. Our policy has been determined, and the ques-

tion is, having got the playgrounds, Are we going to provide the money necessary to maintain them? Fifteen thousand dollars would go a long ways toward that, although it would not be quite sufficient. There would still have to be a voluntary subscription.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, what are the items of expense entering into the maintenance or making up the cost of the playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. The main items are teachers and attendants. I think that amounts to about \$10,000, out of \$18,000. The other items I can not give the gentleman in detail.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, where is this land located that is to be bought?

Mr. PARSONS. No land is to be bought. This is simply for maintaining the playgrounds we now have in the District, seeing that they are properly utilized, and that the small children as well as the large children have an opportunity to use them, and that the weak children have an equal opportunity with the strong ones.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman intend to say that they are going to use \$15,000 to keep up these thirteen playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. Fifteen thousand dollars? It will cost \$18,000 at least, and probably \$21,000.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What are you going to do with the money?

Mr. PARSONS. Some of it is needed for equipment.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, how much?

Mr. PARSONS. I can not give the gentleman the items exactly, but the most of it is used for attendants—teachers to supervise the playgrounds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Teachers to supervise the playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. Teachers to supervise the playgrounds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are they not already provided for?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] has expired.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Where are those teachers to come from?

Mr. PARSONS. They come from the District.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are they already in the employ of the Government as teachers?

Mr. PARSONS. I do not know whether they are or not. I do not know how they are selected.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What do they teach?

Mr. PARSONS. They supervise the use of the playgrounds. You can not have playgrounds in cities unless you supervise them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you mean to say you are going to employ teachers to teach the children how to play? And how much is going to be paid for that?

Mr. PARSONS. On an acre of ground there may be 600 children to play.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They can play without being taught.

Mr. PARSONS. They can not play without being supervised.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Whose children are they?

Mr. PARSONS. The children of the people of the District, and mostly poor children.

Mr. SABATH. It is absolutely necessary to have some one in charge, is it not?

Mr. PARSONS. It is absolutely necessary to have some one in charge. The experience of other cities has been that if you have playgrounds that are not supervised, you have to abandon your playgrounds, because the large and strong boys come there and monopolize the playground, and there is no opportunity for the smaller children, the girls, and the weaker children, to utilize the playgrounds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You say the big boys come there and monopolize the playgrounds, and you want a teacher to teach the boys how not to monopolize. Why not get a policeman to do that, and not pay \$18,000 a year?

Mr. PARSONS. It will cost a great deal more than \$18,000 to have the thing done by the police, I will venture to say.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are not policemen already employed to keep in order all the public parks of the city of Washington?

Mr. PARSONS. It would require the time of at least 31 policemen, and take them away from their other duties, to take care of this work.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are not policemen stationed in the vicinity of all the schools already, and do they not watch every park in the city of Washington now?

Mr. PARSONS. I never saw them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, I have.

Mr. PARSONS. I do not believe they do and I do not believe they can.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They police the White House grounds and Jackson square, and they police all the parks that I have ever walked through and all that I have ever seen anybody else walk through.

Mr. PARSONS. Does not the gentleman understand that if you have five or six hundred children on an acre lot in an afternoon, if they are all going to get exercise you must have somebody there to see that all have a chance and to organize the kind of games that will call upon all of them to take part.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will tell you what I saw when I came through the city of Cincinnati not long ago. I saw a playground, a little park, and a lot of children were out there, swinging just as you and I have swung. There were no teachers there, so far as I saw. All were children. Everybody could go there. Everyone seemed to be swinging and playing, and they were all enjoying themselves.

Mr. PARSONS. How many children were there?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, I presume there were 25 or 30.

Mr. PARSONS. Suppose there had been 600 children there?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The park was not big enough for that.

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, well, that is one of the difficulties. The parks are not big enough.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But there was no teacher there to teach the 25 or 30 children that I saw to play. Nobody taught them how to play "leap frog" and "bull pen," and all the other things that children play; "skin the cat," and all the rest of the games for children. This is a game to skin the District treasury to teach these children how to play "leap frog." Why, I will say to my distinguished friend that I can teach them, and I will not charge \$18,000 a year to show these little children how to play. It seems to me a huge lot of money to devote to such a purpose.

Mr. PARSONS. I object to the gentleman making a speech in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have ten minutes to show what he wants to do with this \$18,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARSONS. I do not need the ten minutes unless the gentleman from Tennessee is going to make my speech. [Laughter.] Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it not a fact that out of this fund the kindergarten teachers are employed, and also instructors in athletics?

Mr. PARSONS. It is, to some extent. Of course the very small children have to have teachers, as I understand, to enable the great number of them to make the best use of the small spaces for playgrounds. As far as the athletic instructors are concerned, that again is necessary for supervision, for manly behavior, and to see that the weak boys do not overdo, and that they take the exercise that is necessary to develop them.

There has been an interesting experience here. They have a standard for athletics, a standard maintained by the Public Schools Athletic League of New York City, and each year they have a tournament to find out how many children come up to that standard. Of course the increase shows the physical benefits that come from these playgrounds. The increase has been something tremendous; I think it is something like 200 per cent each year.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask my colleague what the experience of other cities is, if he knows, as to playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. There are over 100 cities which maintain playgrounds. I understand that some other Members will describe the experience of their own cities. As my colleague knows, we, in New York, are tremendously handicapped from the fact that where we most need the playgrounds it is most expensive to get them. Some years ago we started the policy of using the areaways around the public schools as playgrounds. The movement started in order that the areaways around the schools should be used not simply by the scholars during the

recesses, but by them during the afternoons and during the summer vacation time. Unfortunately many of them were covered. Of course, for proper utilization, we had to have teachers. In the vicinity of New York I think we now have 531 teachers engaged in connection with these schools and their playgrounds.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PARSONS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX of Indiana. How does New York maintain its playgrounds—by taxation or private contribution?

Mr. PARSONS. By taxation.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I have observed in the papers that various cities in the United States are maintaining playgrounds by means of taxation. Now, can the gentleman inform the House if there is anything in the law now governing the District of Columbia that would prevent the citizens of Washington from placing a local tax on themselves for the purpose of maintaining playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. I understand that the only tax we could have would be a tax as a result of this appropriation bill. Am I not correct?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman know whether there is any statute in force to prevent the citizens from imposing a tax on themselves to maintain playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. Absolutely none. This is the only way we can provide any tax to be assessed on the citizens of Washington.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PARSONS. I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. I understood the gentleman to state that on some playgrounds there were 600 children assembled on 1 acre?

Mr. PARSONS. That is my opinion.

Mr. SIMS. I am not questioning the fact. What I want to ask is, Does the gentleman from New York think that it is in the interest of good health and proper sanitation to assemble as many as 600 children promiscuously on 1 acre of ground to play or for any other purpose?

Mr. PARSONS. I should prefer that it would not be necessary, but you have to do the best you can with what you have. The children come there, and what are you going to do—turn them away? The best way is to have money to get teachers to supervise and see that they all have a chance.

Mr. SIMS. But is not it injurious and liable to spread contagious disease to assemble 600 children on 1 acre of ground?

Mr. PARSONS. It is not so bad as to assemble that many children in one school.

Mr. SIMS. But that is necessary in order to educate them.

Mr. PARSONS. This is education, too; physical and moral education.

Mr. SIMS. I understand there are 18 playgrounds now connected with the school buildings. How many school buildings are there that have not playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman from Tennessee probably knows better than I do.

Mr. SIMS. There are over 100 school buildings, and the scheme is to go on until we have a playground for each public school.

Mr. PARSONS. I do not know that, although I hope that is the scheme.

But that has not anything to do with this amendment. This amendment provides simply for maintenance and use of the playgrounds we now have.

Mr. SIMS. To pay the salaries of teachers?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not a fact that one-half of the disbursements last year was for salaries?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. So that when we have gotten more than a hundred schools, as well as the municipal, the appropriation will be \$100,000 a year instead of \$15,000 a year?

Mr. PARSONS. I do not think that argument follows, because the attendance on the municipal playgrounds, which are only thirteen in number, is one-third greater than the attendance on all of the school playgrounds, which amounts to eighteen, so the expense for the school playgrounds is much less.

Mr. BROADHEAD. Does this District of Columbia pay one-half of this appropriation?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes; the District of Columbia will pay one-half of this appropriation.

Mr. BROADHEAD. So that of this \$15,000 only \$7,500 comes out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Is it not a fact that Washington already has more parks and playgrounds for the children than any other city in the United States, in proportion to the population?

Mr. PARSONS. No; it has not.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. What other cities have as much?

Mr. PARSONS. I do not exactly know, but—

Mr. MANN. Why, my district in Chicago would have twenty acres to one to that in Washington.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Of playgrounds or parks?

Mr. MANN. Parks and playgrounds, either one.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Is it not a fact that under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, the amount proposed to be appropriated, \$15,000, would go, instead of to the benefit of the children, to a lot of paid teachers, and the children would not get the benefit of any fresh air and playgrounds?

Mr. PARSONS. You can not use the playgrounds unless you have teachers to supervise these children. That has been the experience of every city in the country that maintains playgrounds. I just stated that that was our experience in New York, and, as a matter of fact, if you have the teachers to supervise the playgrounds you have more children there. In New York it has been discovered that even where there are vacant places adjoining the smaller playgrounds, the children will go to the smaller playgrounds where there is a teacher rather than to the vacant place, because in the vacant place the large boys will come and monopolize it and there will be no chance for the great mass of children, especially for the girls and smaller children and weaker boys.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Does the gentleman think it a fair comparison to compare the conditions in the city of Washington with the conditions in the city of New York, in view of the fact that New York is much more densely populated and thickly crowded than Washington?

Mr. PARSONS. That is true; but the reason I mention New York is because some of our experience in New York is applicable here. Our difficulty in New York is this, that we were behindhand in providing for playgrounds, and know the difficulties that confront us. Our anxiety is that the District of Columbia shall be up-to-date and foresighted about the matter.

Mr. HAMLIN. How many playgrounds are being provided for?

Mr. PARSONS. Not any. The playgrounds have already been provided for. We appropriated two years ago \$75,000 with which to buy playgrounds. All my amendment seeks to do is to provide the money to make good use of the playgrounds we already have.

Mr. HAMLIN. What items enter into the making up of this expenditure?

Mr. PARSONS. You have to have a certain amount of equipment, and then you have to have teachers to supervise the children in the playgrounds.

Mr. SABATH. And to maintain the playgrounds in good condition.

Mr. PARSONS. And to maintain them.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman in his idea of the equipment of these playgrounds conceive that they should be equipped for the children or the adults?

Mr. PARSONS. For the children.

Mr. BOWERS. Then how does the gentleman support that proposition of the playground people presented to the committee of turning one of the playgrounds in Washington in the northeast section, I may say—without being certain of the location, and if it is challenged I will turn to the RECORD and make it more specific—into a general establishment for the benefit of all of the people of the District, including a very elaborate bathing plant?

Mr. PARSONS. As I read the hearings of the committee, the proposition of the people in the District was that provision might also be made so that late in the afternoon and in the evening some of the playgrounds could be used by adults. My amendment has nothing to do with that.

Mr. BOWERS. But the gentleman's amendment, if it is adopted, will be used toward the maintenance of these grounds for the very purpose that I have stated, unless people who advocate this proposition have misstated the reasons for which they desire the appropriation.

Mr. PARSONS. My amendment will not further the plan the gentleman speaks of any more than the provision now in the bill will.

Mr. BOWERS. But the provision now in the bill, with its limited amount, will make it absolutely certain that no such misuse—if I may use that term, and I confess that I would regard it as a misuse—will be made.

Mr. PARSONS. Let me say in reply to the gentleman, that in appropriating for the children of the District it does not seem to me that we should give an absolutely insufficient appropriation for fear that a sufficient one might be used for some other purpose when experience shows—

Mr. BOWERS. It is a matter of confessed purpose in the premises.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman refer me to a statement by the commissioners in the hearings which states that?

Mr. BOWERS. I do not know that I can refer now to the statement of the commissioners, but I am able to refer, and will do it in a moment, if the gentleman will indulge me, to the statements of those who advocated this particular proposition and were interrogated by me with reference to it.

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, well, they advocated a great many other things.

Mr. BOWERS. If I may further interrupt the gentleman, they have advocated so many things that they have put this committee, and I fear the House, in the situation of the fellow from Tennessee who wanted to join the church, and when they had interrogated him about a number of nonessentials and had asked him whether he believed that the Hebrew children had passed through the fiery furnace, whether he believed that Christ had walked on the waters, and had interrogated him pretty generally on the matter of miracles, they finally asked him if he believed that Jonah had swallowed the whale; and, after a little hesitation, and being very anxious to join the church, he accepted that proposition also. They then passed from the matter of nonessentials to essentials, and inquired of him if he believed that Jesus Christ had died to save all men, and his reply was that he believed he died to save everybody except Bill Smith. [Laughter.]

The inquiry was then put to him why Bill was exempted from the general plan of salvation, and he rejoined for manifest reasons: First, because Bill was so ornery that nobody wanted to save him; and second, because if that attempt was made it would be entirely useless, because no amount of saving grace could reach Bill Smith. After having discussed that matter thoroughly with the proposed applicant they said to him:

We are very sorry, but unless you can subscribe to this doctrine you can not come inside.

And he, having his blood up a little in the premises, said:

Well, I don't believe it, and since you put me on my mettle, I don't believe that big fish tale, either.

[Laughter.]

That is the attitude in which the advocates of this matter perhaps have got the committee, and I fear the House.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman tell the House who taught the little children how to roll eggs back of the White House?

Mr. PARSONS. Who teaches them?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They go and roll eggs back of the White House, some of the eggs break and some do not; but nobody cries about it. Who taught those children how to go down there and play?

Mr. PARSONS. I do not know; the amendment does not cover it.

Mr. SABATH. They have seen it done.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That shows the farcical nature of the proposition which the gentleman is trying to get adopted by the committee, however honest and sincere he is in it. Nature teaches children how to play.

Mr. PARSONS. Let me say this in regard to nature: The experience of the cities tells us what nature in cities does with children. Now, the experience of cities is that for the health and well-being of the children such playgrounds are necessary, and it is necessary that they should be supervised. That is what nature teaches about children in cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move the following amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New York, and ask that it be read at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by substituting for the words "fifteen thousand" the words "seven thousand dollars."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I would not for a moment be put in the position of denying the children of this District

playgrounds or anything of the sort, but it does seem to me that after the committee has given this matter consideration, a jump from \$1,500 to \$15,000 is a considerable step for the House to take without more information than it has. Furthermore, after what we have heard here, since the consideration of this District bill began, about the condition of taxation in the District of Columbia, I for one am glad to hear from the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] that the citizens of this town are willing and do tax themselves something for the maintenance of these playgrounds. I do believe that a just means can be found between the recommendation of the committee and that of the original amendment. So I offer this amendment in the hope that the citizens will contribute something toward this thoroughly worthy object out of their own pockets.

Mr. CAULFIELD, Mr. GAINES of Tennessee, and Mr. PETERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS].

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, the child without a playground is the parent of the man without a job. Playgrounds in our cities have come to be considered part of our public educational systems, and to-day are becoming universally recognized as such.

I have heard this discussion, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to add a word which I believe will be pertinent, and which brings in the experience of the city where I live, and which shows at that place the success of the playgrounds for the children. The city of Boston is the pioneer city in connection with this form of public education. The first public gymnasium was started in 1886 in the city of Boston, and at that place was provided the first of the sand gardens for the children. From such small beginnings the city to-day maintains for its children 196 acres of playgrounds.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Do you provide teachers and attendants there in the playgrounds for the children?

Mr. PETERS. I am very glad to try and say what we are doing. We do.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Do you do that?

Mr. PETERS. We do. Those 196 acres are scattered in 52 playgrounds. They cost our city nearly \$4,000,000 to construct, and there is no question to-day, Mr. Chairman, but they are regarded by every man as an important part of the children's life, and in no small way help to develop from our children men and women with vigorous bodies and healthy minds. Last year the city of Boston appropriated \$83,000 for the use of these playgrounds, providing additional apparatus and providing instructors. The use and the necessity of an instructor for these children is well recognized and necessary, for the reasons that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] has just stated. A supervisor keeps the older children from crowding out the younger ones, teaches the younger children various sports, and enables the children to secure from the opportunities of the playground the greatest benefit. The playground has become so well recognized as a part of children's education that during this last year the matter was brought up before the legislature of Massachusetts and a special act was passed, the passage of which I think is very significant as showing the general recognition of the playgrounds theory in Massachusetts, a part of the country where it first was started and where to-day it is in most general use.

This act provides that it should be submitted for acceptance to every city of over 10,000 inhabitants. It provides that the city which accepts the act shall provide a playground for the children, and for every additional 20,000 inhabitants above 10,000 shall provide an additional playground. And in regard to instructors for these, I will read just one section of the act.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman advocate in a country town with a population as small as 10,000 people the setting aside of a playground for children that can play anywhere on the face of the earth in that town?

Mr. PETERS. Why, sir, that is not the question before this House.

Mr. BOWERS. But it is a part of the gentleman's recital of the excellent progress of this most admirable system of playgrounds.

Mr. PETERS. Certainly. Washington has many times ten thousand, and I think the question of whether the children need playgrounds is one that could be fairly submitted to the people, and one which is submitted to the people in this act of Massachusetts.

In reply to the question as to the necessity for supervisors, the act which I referred to says:

Acts of 1908, chapter 513, section 2:
"The cities and towns may appoint, and determine the compensation of, the qualified supervisor of each playground, who shall direct the sports and exercises thereon."

This act, Mr. Chairman, was submitted to 23 cities in the municipal elections in Massachusetts this last December, and of those 23 cities—after full discussion in the newspapers, after the broadest kind of study of the problem—22 voted to accept this provision, only one city failing to do so, and that city by a vote which was practically a tie vote and on the ground that the city was already heavily indebted.

Of the people who passed on this question in Massachusetts over 125,000 voted in favor of accepting the provisions of this act and slightly over 23,000 voted in opposition to it.

Mr. SIMS. The cities paid all the expense, did they not? The State of Massachusetts did not pay it.

Mr. PETERS. The cities paid it, and each city for itself voted whether that particular city should adopt that particular act. It is now being put in operation, commencing the 1st of January, in these 22 cities. And I want to say to the gentleman that in the city of Boston the playgrounds to-day are not standing still, but are increasing in general use, and the public opinion there, after a practical demonstration of the question, absolutely supports the theory of playgrounds as an essential part of our school system. I hope here we may meet our responsibility to the people of Washington by adopting this as a part of our educational system. [Applause.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am the last man in the House or out of it who would deny a child the opportunity to play. We have more parks in the city of Washington than any city of which I have any knowledge, and I want to say that I have traveled considerably through the United States. The parks are conveniently located. They are all over the city. About each and every one of these parks is a splendid policeman who keeps it in order, and who keeps the big boy off the little ones and vice versa, for sometimes the little boy jumps on the big ones.

Mr. Chairman, it is an utter absurdity to talk about starting this thing of having a wilderness of teachers in the city of Washington to teach a child how to play "leap frog" and how to swing in one of those swinging machines, or how to ride in a merry-go-round or how to play "horse," as I used to do from the time I was big enough for my little legs to straddle a fence rail.

Mr. MANN. Who provides all this play machinery in our parks?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I presume Uncle Sam does.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. That is what this provision is sought for. The gentleman thinks the children do not need to be taught to play, but they do not have the things to play on. That is the trouble.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose "play" machinery is necessary for children. Are there not a thousand and one other things that the people of the United States are appealing to this Congress to provide; and are they not answered with the chorus, "A deficit in the Treasury?" Why shall we go along here and in hundreds of small matters pay out the people's tax money, fritter it away, putting a little spigot here in the Treasury and a little spigot yonder in the Treasury, which will continue to pour out the people's tax money into the highways and byways of the city of Washington and elsewhere in the United States?

Is there never to be any retrenchment or reform in paying out public money? Is every little whim and caprice of the school-teachers of this country to be humored? I have been a school-teacher myself, and I deeply sympathize with them, and want to aid them within fair and reasonable lines. I regret that I have not had in my life more school-teachers than I had an opportunity to have; but nobody taught me how to play or plow. No one taught one man in this House how to entertain himself at school, or upon the farm, or in the city where he was reared. He taught himself.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think it would have greatly improved him if he had learned how to play, instead of taking everything so seriously all the time?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, not when I ought to be serious, and I think this is one of the times. The gentleman says teachers are wanted to police the little children. Now, the policing proposition is useless; you all know that. You can not get 600 children on an acre of ground and allow them to play anything. That is an absurdity.

And when you come seriously to look at the question, I do not believe that you need any machinery. Here is the beautiful greensward out here about the White House, There is

Jackson Square; there is Lincoln Park; there is Rock Creek Park.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman know that the children can not play, as children ought to play, in Jackson Square, or McPherson Square, or Franklin Square, and that the Carnegie library has spoiled that square as a playground?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Carnegie libraries spoil a great many things, in my estimation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In all those places there are signs that say, "Keep off the grass." Last summer, one hot day, I saw boys in the streets playing where the Carnegie library stands usurping what ought to be left for playgrounds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What are the parks for?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am only stating the facts as they exist.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, that argues there are too many policemen, and you are calling for money to get more.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know that children can not play on the Capitol grounds, that they can not play on the Mall, that they can not play on the grounds around any public building in Washington, and that the only place the Government freely provides, outside of the playgrounds, are the streets, and there is a law against that which is being enforced at times.

Mr. VREELAND. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. VREELAND. Congress has already provided 14 municipal playgrounds and 18 grounds around schoolhouses for small children to play in, besides all the great system of public parks where perhaps games can not be played.

Mr. MANN. Where if you get on the grass you are warned off.

Mr. VREELAND. Yes; in the municipal parks.

Mr. MANN. In the other parks.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman where these municipal playgrounds are?

Mr. VREELAND. I will read them later when I come to address the House.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is not objecting to grounds being provided for?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No; we have the grounds.

Mr. ADAIR. It is simply to the provision for teachers?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes. Who teaches the little lamb how to play on the sunny hillside? [Laughter.] Why, nature. Nature, who taught all of our children and that nature which teaches us now that we are grown men.

Mr. PARSONS. Let me ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he objects to the kindergarten teachers in the public schools?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not know; I do not suppose I am opposed to that. I am in favor of all schools that are useful, and I am for more children and fewer poodle dogs. [Laughter.] The next thing you know you will be asked to appropriate for and provide playgrounds for the "poodles" that have entered into society. [Laughter.]

Let us not run away with the people's money. If this thing should be done, that is one proposition; but I say that you do not need to police the grounds or need teachers to teach children how to play. Why, gentlemen, I have discovered so much of the policing of public grounds—as the gentleman from Illinois has said, we are so surrounded by the police, that you can not step on the grass anywhere. These parks were made for breathing places. I have seen hundreds of little children in Jackson Park and I have seen them in Lincoln Park, and there there was no keeping off the grass. There are various other parks around here, in the very heart of the city, which are intended for the people of this District, young and old, to go there and get the fresh air and pump it into their lungs and revitalize and invigorate their bodies, and I object to taking this money and going out and employing a wilderness of teachers to teach the boy how to play. I am opposed to "sissyizing" our boys. That chloroforms his genius and his character.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] is a lawyer, and let him think of the number of turntable lawsuits where children have been hurt by the turntable. They naturally want to see something go round, something whirl. But here you come in and say we must employ a wilderness of teachers to go out and teach the children how to run their little carts, how to play mumblepeg, how to play leapfrog and bullfrog, roll the hoop, and all these other things that is in the little one's heart the moment that he or she strikes an open

place, and which comes just as natural as it does for them to breathe.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the city of Washington gets enough of God's fresh breath here by the use of the public grounds, as the result of the tax money of this country. Why do you have playgrounds here and do not have them elsewhere?

Mr. PARSONS. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why do not you go out in Arizona? I knew the gentleman would think he would tempt me with that, but the Government has complete jurisdiction in the Territories. Why do not you go elsewhere; why do not you go up in Alaska and teach the Eskimo how to play?

Mr. MANN. We are doing it at a great expense, and the gentleman votes for it all the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman if he indorses that?

Mr. MANN. Sure.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, that may do for the savage.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that in the greater part of Arizona any children who may be there have plenty of play room, much more than in the city of Washington?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes, they have it; but they do not have any teachers or anybody to teach them how to play. Did anybody teach the gentleman from Pennsylvania how to play?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Oh, no; that was natural. Give me the playground, and I will be able to play.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Exactly; but we have them all over the city, and also Rock Creek Park. You might as well say have somebody teach fish how to swim as to teach children how to play.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, it is very easy for a Member to rise in his seat to belittle this amendment. It is always easy to stand as a friend of the people; to bewail the extravagant expenditure of money. So the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] found it very easy to urge the committee to vote against this amendment because, really, this great Republic could not afford to let the people of the District use \$15,000 during the next fiscal year to maintain playgrounds for the children of Washington. He stood aghast at the thought of the employment of teachers—I have forgotten the gentleman's expression as to numbers.

Mr. PARSONS. "A wilderness."

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Yes; that was his expression. He is worried at the thought of "a wilderness" of teachers being employed in connection with the supervision of these playgrounds. I confess I never saw a wilderness of teachers, and so I am not as deeply disturbed as is he. He probably used the word "wilderness" in the sense in which we find it used in the Scriptures—to indicate a desert—and he warns the representatives of the American people against the employment of a desert of teachers. Then, too, he does not approve of supervision. He fears that this means teaching the children to play, and he assures us that he was never taught how to play. To be sure, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] asked him if he was in favor of kindergartens, he was forced to say that he supposed he was. But what is the kindergarten? As the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] suggests, it is the system by which the child is taken from its mother's knee and taught to play as the beginning of its education.

What is the proposition before us? Two years ago we appropriated \$75,000 with which to purchase playgrounds for the children of Washington. In addition to the grounds thus provided for there are a goodly number of municipal grounds around the public school buildings. A year ago we appropriated \$1,500 with which to equip and maintain these grounds. It was found that this would not begin to do the work, and between \$15,000 and \$18,000 was raised by private subscription and through the contribution of the children themselves and through the kindly aid of the gracious lady in the White House. This money was expended in equipping and maintaining these playgrounds. Again the Committee on Appropriations provides in the pending bill for \$1,500 for the maintenance of these grounds during the next fiscal year. The purpose of this amendment is to provide an appropriation adequate for this work. The question, Shall the people of the Capital City of the Nation have the advantage of these playgrounds for which we appropriated \$75,000 two years ago or shall we set apart the

niggardly sum of \$1,500 and say, with the gentleman from Tennessee, that we are facing a deficit and can not afford to do more?

I believe in economy. I believe that this year is a good time to practice economy; but I do not believe in beginning with the children of Washington, who are entirely dependent upon us for all school privileges. It was reported this morning that the Committee on Naval Affairs will ask us to appropriate \$30,000,000 for the construction of two great battle ships. Yet when it comes to a question of properly maintaining these playgrounds we are told that we can not afford it. And, mind you, every dollar of the \$30,000,000 for those two battle ships will come out of the United States Treasury, while this paltry sum of \$15,000, which the people of Washington desire to have appropriated, strictly speaking, will come out of the taxes raised by the people of Washington.

It is their own money, raised by taxation for their municipal purposes. Of course it is true that the National Government is a taxpayer in the District of Columbia, and I for one do not believe that it pays any more than its fair proportion of the taxes. The people of the country will feel, I am sure, that the gentleman from Tennessee was not fortunate in selecting the point at which he would start upon his career of economy. They desire to see their Capital City a model city. They desire to see its schools model schools. They desire to see its children cared for, so far as the public is concerned, in a model way. We have the playgrounds already—about 32 of them.

Mr. PARSONS. Thirteen municipal and 18 school grounds.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Yes; to be exact we have 31 of these playgrounds. Now, shall we provide the necessary equipment? Shall we maintain them? Shall we provide that supervision which experience everywhere has shown is necessary? Shall we, by appropriating \$15,000, secure to the children of Washington such privileges of playgrounds as are enjoyed in other large cities?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Yes; certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. When the gentleman says that Congress two years ago appropriated \$75,000 for playgrounds in the city of Washington, I would like to inquire if that was for the purchase of real estate or for paraphernalia?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. It was for the purchase of real estate. Seventy-five thousand dollars was appropriated for the purchase of playgrounds.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman tell us, if he can, how much real estate that amount of money actually purchased for the purpose of playgrounds?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I can not give the gentleman the information he desires. Very likely the chairman of the subcommittee, who has the bill in charge, can tell just what property was purchased.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Just one more question, whether or not that was the first time that the Government of the United States entered upon the policy of purchasing playgrounds for children in the city of Washington? Had it been going on prior to that?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, as I am informed and believe, this was the first time that the Government appropriated money for the purchase of playgrounds. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] asks why not start the scheme out in Arizona. But the gentleman should know that the Congress has entire control over everything connected with the municipal government of the city of Washington, and that no such condition exists between the National Government and the Territory of Arizona. The Territory has its own government. It raises its own taxes. It has full authority to maintain its playgrounds wherever needed.

But we are responsible for conditions in the city of Washington. Some of our friends are afraid of extravagance in the employment of men and women in connection with the supervision of these playgrounds. But supervision is absolutely necessary. You never see a crowd of grown ups at a ball game but you find policemen there. On these playgrounds we want baseball grounds, and football grounds, and tennis courts, and other instrumentalities for healthful outdoor life and exercise. Then, in order that all these things may be enjoyed to the uttermost by the children, we must have adequate supervision. So, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment increasing the appropriation for maintaining the playgrounds from \$1,500 to \$15,000. I repeat that, to all intents and purposes, it comes out of the taxes raised by the people of the District. The people of the District want this appropriation, and the appropriation will meet with the approval of the good people throughout the land. We are voting for the children when we vote for this appropriation. If, after voting for this appropriation, any of the members of the committee feel conscience stricken

on the ground of extravagance, if they will come to me I will join hands with them and help to make the appropriation for battle ships \$15,000,000 instead of \$30,000,000, thus providing one battle ship instead of two. By doing this we shall practice actual economy, not as to the treasury of the District of Columbia, but as to the Treasury of the United States, where the deficit to which the gentleman from Tennessee so feelingly referred exists. Vote for the amendment, and if you have any question as to the wisdom of your course, come to Washington next July and go over the playgrounds and see the healthy enjoyment they afford to the little people of the District, and next year \$15,000 will be appropriated without debate for the purposes of our playgrounds.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words as to the position of the committee on this question and as to the reasons which have governed it in making this appropriation. The appropriation carried in this bill for maintenance and salaries in connection with the playground system, which includes the swimming pools down on the flats, is \$4,550. One thousand five hundred dollars is for maintenance of playgrounds, and \$3,050 for salaries and equipment in relation to the bathing pools, and we are informed that both these are included in one system. The question that is before the committee for discussion is not whether we will have playgrounds for the children of Washington. That policy has already been entered upon. A large number of playgrounds have already been provided. As I have stated before, there are now 14 municipal playgrounds—those are the figures furnished to us by those having it in charge—now in existence in this city where children can play. They can be divided up—

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman said 14 had been provided by Congress. Does he mean that?

Mr. VREELAND. I do not think all of them were provided by Congress. Congress has appropriated \$75,000 or \$100,000 in cash and, if I recollect right, has turned over some land, which is now being used for a playground system. At any rate, the city of Washington now has 14 municipal playgrounds. It is so well provided with them within the city limits that they are now starting playgrounds outside the city limits, out in the District of Columbia, which is as much country as almost any region beyond it in the State of Maryland. Besides that, we have 18 playgrounds around these schoolhouses. Now, we recognize that these are not playgrounds where baseball and football can be played, but they are playgrounds where the small children can play, away from the rough sports of the larger boys. They are all used for that purpose. Application came in this year for 6 additional playgrounds around the schoolhouses of this city.

It is the intention of the committee to provide the schoolhouses of the city with these smaller playgrounds for small children, but owing to the state of the Treasury this year and other reasons, it was thought best to pass this appropriation over for another year. Now, if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York passes this committee, it will not add a foot to the ground where the children of Washington can play; it will merely provide for a corps of attendants who are to take charge of their sports, who are to teach them the games which American boys for a hundred years have taught themselves. Now, that I may not be accused of exaggeration in saying this would provide for a swarm of attendants, I want to give some information of the number employed last year. The chairman of the Playgrounds Association, Mr. Rudolph, was asked the question, How much money raised last year went for the salaries of these attendants—these people who stand around and superintend the sports of these boys and girls—and he said that, without having the actual figures, he would say there were about 100 people employed, at an average salary of \$40 per month. Thus we are embarking upon an undertaking, not to provide additional playgrounds. That policy has already been entered upon by the House; that policy has the sanction and approval of this committee, and appropriations will be brought in in the future by this committee as the needs of the city and the city's finances permit.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman permit? Does this appropriation of \$18,000 provide for attendants in addition to the 100 already provided for that purpose?

Mr. VREELAND. It will not only include the attendance of the 100 who are already employed, but enlarge the number.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. What was the amount of the appropriation last year for that purpose?

Mr. VREELAND. The amount of the appropriation last year for this purpose of playgrounds was \$1,500. Then, in addition, we provided several thousand dollars for the bathing pool as part of the playgrounds system.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I did not understand the statement of the gentleman just now that there are 100 employees at \$40 a month employed out of the appropriation for last year. That would be—

Mr. VREELAND. Why, the people of Washington last year had a little chance to show their civic pride and their energy—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted ten minutes additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I would like to ask my colleague how much money was spent last year, including our appropriation and that made up by citizens.

Mr. VREELAND. Well, there was something like eighteen or nineteen thousand dollars, I believe, spent on the playgrounds.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Spent in maintenance?

Mr. VREELAND. Something like eighteen or nineteen thousand dollars.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I would like to ask my colleague how 100 people at \$40 a month, making \$4,000 a month, could be retained throughout the year on \$18,000.

Mr. VREELAND. Well, I was reading from the statement of Mr. Rudolph, the president of the Playgrounds Association. Of course these people are not employed throughout the year. I do not believe they are employed in January, February, or March; but during the months they were employed there were 100 people who received, according to the statement of the president of the Playgrounds Association, an average of \$40 a month.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does that mean 100 people employed at the same time or 100 different people employed during the course of the year?

Mr. VREELAND. The president of the Playgrounds Association says [reading]:

Without having the actual figures here I should say there were 100 people employed and their average salary was \$40 a month.

Of course, they are not employed during the whole year. I suppose these playgrounds are not in use now, and these men are not employed now to take charge of football or baseball, but during the portion of the year when they were employed that is the number and that is the amount they received.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman stated just now that the people of Washington had an opportunity to show their civic pride, and just at that time he was interrupted.

Mr. VREELAND. I was about to state that it has always seemed to me that the citizens of this beautiful capital lack more in civic pride than the people of any other city in the United States. It seems to me—perhaps I am unjust in saying it—that the energy which in other cities, through business associations, goes to the building of the city; to all the things to which they devote their enterprise, is here turned into the channel of securing appropriations from the Treasury.

I think I am safe in saying that the property in the city of Washington pays less than half the taxes that is paid in any other city in the United States. The tax rate here is 1½ per cent, but the property on which it is taxed is not assessed probably on the average over 35 or 38 per cent. Hence gentlemen can see that the rate of taxation in this city is probably one-half that of any other large city in the country, and yet there is no city in the United States where the people do so little for themselves as they do in this city of Washington.

Why, to-day there are some 65 cities in the United States that maintain these playgrounds associations, the land for which has been purchased by the public-spirited citizens of those cities, and the amounts necessary to maintain them is annually raised by the citizens. But here in Washington, after one or two years of effort, after having safely got the movement started, they fall back upon the National Treasury to keep it going. I say to you, gentlemen, that you are starting in here upon a course of appropriation which, if acceded to, means hundreds of thousands of dollars in the next few years. Do the gentlemen think I am exaggerating in making that statement? Why, the sum of \$247,000 is asked for this year in this very appropriation bill that is presented to this committee.

Mr. PARSONS. For maintenance?

Mr. VREELAND. For the playgrounds movement.

Mr. PARSONS. For maintenance?

Mr. VREELAND. The gentleman's amendment is all for maintenance.

Mr. PARSONS. I inquired how much is asked for maintenance?

Mr. VREELAND. It includes the purchase of additional playgrounds, it includes the maintenance, it includes new swimming pools, and we are notified that as the next step upon one of these playgrounds, called the "Rosedale playground," they are to ask us for a municipal gymnasium costing \$48,000, in which are to be put shower baths and tubs, and not only the children are to be invited to use them, but the grown people of the city are to be invited to go there and use them. That opens up a prospect for a great number of attendants to take care of these people and keep the tubs clean and to keep the people in order. As soon as that is presented, some other portion of the city will say, "Where is our municipal gymnasium?" and that must be provided for. So the never-ending demand on the Treasury keeps up.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VREELAND. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. The amendment that I have offered relates, does it not, simply to the maintenance and use of the playgrounds that we already have embarked upon?

Mr. VREELAND. There is no question about that. It has been brought out often enough. The gentleman desires to relieve the people of the city of Washington from providing its own attendants that they had last year to supervise the games of the children. A year ago in our appropriation bill we put in \$1,500 for furnishing the utensils and implements with which the children are to play. We put in that appropriation to complete, \$1,500. Does that mean that the appropriation was dropped and that they have stopped asking for it? Not at all. That means simply that they have started an appropriation which is to go on forever and a day. Now, gentlemen, this committee is not opposed to playgrounds for children. This movement started some ten or fifteen years ago in Germany, in the densely built up cities thereof, where they have no playgrounds for the children, no chance for them to get a breath of fresh air. Properly they started movements there to lay aside tracts where the children could go and play. It was then taken up in this country.

I can understand why gentlemen like my friends from New York [Mr. BENNET and Mr. PARSONS], living, as they do, in the great metropolis, viewing the conditions which exist there, may overestimate the necessity for making large appropriations for these playgrounds in the city of Washington. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is no more comparison between New York and Washington as to the necessity of these great open spaces than there is between Washington and Alexandria. Washington is nothing but a great country town. Fifty-nine per cent of all the territory in this city is devoted to public purposes, either parks or streets or circles or something accessible to the public. Just think of it! Fifty-nine per cent and more devoted to that purpose. Go down to the city of New York, with its teeming millions, start in down at the Battery, and you will find crowded streets where even grown people are hardly safe on the sidewalks—a small island bounded on both sides by deep water. There is not a place in that city, scarcely, where a child is safe outside of his mother's sight until you get up to Fifty-ninth street, to the beginning of the park system.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Will my colleague yield for just one correction?

Mr. VREELAND. Yes.

Mr. BENNET of New York. South of Fifty-ninth street there are at least 12 parks.

Mr. VREELAND. Oh, there are some little parks down there, but what I say is that I know of no city in the United States which is as little in need of municipal playgrounds as the city of Washington. Why, it is all a great playground.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman specify just what parks in Washington are adapted for use by the children of Washington as playgrounds? I was informed a little while ago by a Member of this House that one of his children was roller skating in one of the parks and was stopped by the police, and that even that could not be permitted here.

Mr. VREELAND. We have already gone over that time and again. Every gentleman knows from his own experience that children play throughout this whole city. You can go down to-night after we adjourn, down on Pennsylvania avenue, the principal street of Washington, and you will meet dozens of children roller skating on the very sidewalks along which we pass. All over this city are wide streets with very little travel upon them, shady trees where thousands of children enjoy themselves playing, using them for roller skating and other similar purposes. Now, as fast as is consistent with the state of the Public Treasury we are providing great spaces here

where the larger boys can go away by themselves, where they can play games of baseball and football and other games which they love; but where the committee call a halt and where they wish this Committee of the Whole to call a halt is on the building up here of a great plan under which hundreds of people are to be employed in taking care of these grounds, in supervising, as they call it, the play of these children. I say it is a good chance for the public spirit of the city of Washington to show itself. Sixty-five cities to-day are raising their own money to provide the necessary maintenance and equipment and whatever supervision is necessary for the care of grounds. Why can not Washington, for which the National Government does so much, show a little of this spirit which is shown in 65 other cities of the United States?

The time of Mr. VREELAND having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.

Mr. VREELAND. Now, Mr. Chairman, the committee has sought in this matter to pursue a middle course, to pursue a moderate course. We do not agree with the extremists in either case. We do not agree with those who say that it is not necessary to provide any playgrounds in the city of Washington where the children may play. We say they should be provided as fast as is consistent with prudence and with the condition of the Treasury. Neither do we go to the other extreme represented by the gentlemen from New York, where their views are fostered, as I believe, under totally different conditions; while they do not seem to appreciate the difference between New York, with its four millions of population, and this great beautiful city, with 50 per cent of its total area open to the public. I say we are pursuing a middle course and a moderate course.

We are making such appropriations as ought to be made and as are consistent with the state of the Treasury. Why, the gentleman from Massachusetts tells us that this movement was born in Boston ten or twelve years ago. Mr. Chairman, it may be that the movement was born in Boston, but it was born many more years ago than ten or twelve. I maintain that education of these boys of the rising generation should not so much teach them the use of these tools and implements, which they say the teachers show them how to use, as to teach them self-reliance—the development of the ability to take care of themselves; it means to make them independent of outside help. But I do not believe that this course is best followed by having some one stand at the elbow from the time they leave the cradle until they apply for some public job in a department.

Mr. Chairman, I say that this movement started in the city of Boston not ten years ago, but it started at a much earlier date, during the Revolutionary times. The old Boston Common is a historic ground which was provided for the use of the people of Boston and the boys of Boston when this country commenced.

I remember when I was a boy reading some of the history of the city of Boston. I remember reading of the time when the city of Boston was in possession of the British during the Revolutionary war. Lord Howe was in command of that city. History tells us that one morning Lord Howe was informed that there was a delegation of boys who desired to talk with him. He asked that the little fellows be shown in, and in marched five young lads 12 or 13 years old. The spokesman told Lord Howe that their rights had been interfered with by his soldiers; that their right to use the Common, their right to have their sleds in the street and on the Common of the city of Boston, had been interfered with by his soldiers; and then they wanted to know if it was with his knowledge and by his order. They said that unless he took some means to restrain them they would take measures of retaliation. Lord Howe gazed with admiration on those boys and said to them that orders would be issued to prevent his soldiers from interfering further with their sport, and the boys went out. Lord Howe said that it was useless to talk of conquering a country that raised up such boys as those.

I submit, gentlemen, that we are not raising such boys as the city of Boston raised them during Revolutionary times, by supervising every act, not only at home, not only at school, but even when they go out to play, and having hundreds of attendants standing at their elbows to tell them what they must or must not do. [Applause.]

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to have been forgotten in this debate that a large portion of the money will be raised by the city of Washington or the District of Columbia anyway, one-half of the appropriation being raised by them, and in addition to that the additional amount of money, whatever it may be, that is necessary to take care of the grounds. I am heartily in favor of this amendment. The modern system of education provides largely for the education of children, not

only in the school, but on the playgrounds, in the kindergarten, and lower grades. In the public school system of to-day much of the teaching is done by instruction in games and on playgrounds, and in the courses of study in almost all of our normal schools to-day there is provision made for the teaching of teachers how to teach the children to play. There is also a series of text-books published giving information and instruction along those lines. I believe that it is a wise provision to give such instruction and that it should be continued and that we should go ahead and give assistance asked for here. Then, if it is necessary to economize in our expenditures, I would begin somewhere else than on our educational system [applause] and not begin on this system, especially intended for the benefit of the children.

Besides this, in this city of Washington we have in a portion of it as largely a congested population as you have anywhere in this country, and it is among the laboring classes in the city of Washington that this congestion is greatest. It has long been a maxim "A sound mind in a healthy body." Many of the rising generation of this city will be day laborers, and as far as possible the health of that next generation should be provided for. Give an opportunity for the children to play and proper and legitimate instruction, no matter what it may cost, and many of those who otherwise might grow up cripples will grow up strong and be able to take care of themselves. If this amendment was for thirty thousand instead of fifteen I would vote for it just as willingly, and I would vote for it in the city of Washington or anywhere else. I am in favor of instruction, whether in the schoolroom or on the playground.

In all courses of study, in all schools, in all our universities, people are employed to teach the children how to play, and in our universities some of the highest priced men are those who teach our boys how to contest in baseball, football, and rowing, and other athletic sports. We all justify that. I see no reason why this amendment should not be adopted. I do not censure the committee at all for their action, because of the pressing need of economy, but in considering that, we are too apt to lose sight of the fact that in legislating for the city of Washington we are legislating for a State, and we must provide here for all of the things that our States provide for at home. In every one of our States provision is made for this very thing all the way down the line, even to the kindergarten schools, and I am heartily in favor of it. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much whether either this body or the country at large will justify the proposition which has just been submitted by my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. MURPHY], that the highest paid professors in the education of the youth should be those who devote their attention to the development of football and baseball. Whether I am right or wrong on that particular proposition, I have no hesitation in pledging the constituency which I represent on this floor as dissenting from that idea, and I think that my friend from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER] was equally unfortunate in his advocacy of this particular proposition when he ridiculed the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] for his use of the term "a wilderness of teachers." The gentleman from Vermont called attention to the fact that this House had made large appropriations in the matter of playgrounds, and that is true; and this House has made large appropriations in the matter of the administration of those playgrounds. Some years ago the House was betrayed into appropriating a sum of something like \$10,000 for the administration and control and the policing, so to speak, of these grounds.

Do I enlighten my friend from Vermont when I advise him that 30 per cent of that whole appropriation went to the gentleman who called that matter first to the attention of Congress in the shape of a salary as general superintendent of playgrounds? I may be mistaken, but my recollection is that when the provision on this subject was passed in the last District appropriation bill it carried in terms the words, "for completing equipment of playgrounds," and it carried it because the committee and the House were jealous of the use that might be made of a general and large appropriation in that regard. Those words were introduced into that bill because it was the desire of the law-making body to impress upon those charged with the administration of this fund the fact that the sum of money which was carried by that bill meant the completion of the equipment of this project. What answer do we hear to that? The amendment which is introduced by the gentleman from New York does not go, as I understand it, to the matter of equipment. It goes to the matter of administration.

Mr. PARSONS. I understand by the word "maintenance," that that means renewal of equipment as well as salaries for taking care of the grounds and supervising the children.

Mr. BOWERS. It means renewal of equipment? Does the gentleman pretend that the equipment within one short year has become so antiquated, so destroyed, so used, that this fund, ten times the amount which is recommended by the committee, and I do not remember how many times, but quite a number of times, the amount which was reported by this committee one year ago for the completion of this equipment, is now necessary to renew and restore it? Or does the gentleman confess, as must be confessed from a consideration of the hearing, that a large part of the sum which is now asked from Congress and which has been expended out of the contribution which the citizens have made in the administration of the playgrounds, to which I will come in a moment—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARSONS. As I understand, the appropriations made at the last session of Congress were two, one for \$1,500, just the same appropriation that the committee has provided for this year.

Mr. BURLESON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. PARSONS. And the other was for \$500, to be used for a specific purpose, to put in order a part of the playgrounds.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman disagree with me on the proposition that the last appropriation bill carried with it the words "for the completion of the equipment of these grounds?"

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman may read the bill, if he has it.

Mr. MANN. What difference does it make?

Mr. BOWERS. I have not the bill before me, and I am compelled to state from recollection, but I have no hesitation in saying that my recollection is correct and that the amount carried in the last bill on this proposition was for the "completion" of the equipment. Now, I may be wrong about it, but nobody seems to be challenging it, and I see some gentlemen looking at the last law on this subject.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we will know the facts soon, if the gentleman does not seem to know.

Mr. BOWERS. Oh, I will talk long enough for my friend from Illinois to read the old bill, and knowing his habits of care as I do, I know he will check me up to the last degree, and I am not a little bit afraid of the result. [Laughter]

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOWERS. I thank my friend from New York for confirming my recollection.

Mr. PARSONS. I read from the last bill:

Playgrounds: For completing equipment of outdoor playgrounds, \$1,500.
For grading and planting of hedges, trees, and other improvements at Rosedale site, \$5,000.

Mr. BOWERS. Now, Mr. Chairman, at the last session of Congress we appropriated \$1,500 for the completion of this equipment. Has it grown obsolete in twelve months? Has it worn out in twelve months? Is it dead in twelve months? What have my friends to say in response to the suggestion that I made a moment ago in reply to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER], that 30 per cent of the original appropriation made by Congress in this regard went to the salary of one particular official? There is something more. I live in the country. I belong to that fortunate or unfortunate class which the leading exponent of this particular playgrounds system referred to in a lecture, as I am advised, on a night not so long past. When the inquiry was put to him as to why this playground system in the city of Washington did not receive greater support, he replied that, unfortunately, there were five members of the subcommittee who lived in the country. [Laughter.] I want to exempt from that particular criticism one of the most efficient and valuable members of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, Mr. MADDEN, who lives "in the heart of the wilds of Chicago." But, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, living as I do, in the country, I have never seen more space open to those who want to play than there is in the part of the city of Washington in which my own lot has been cast. We are told here that this matter of administration needs a large number of teachers. My own idea is—it may be right and it may be wrong—but my own judgment is that young America had best be educated as young America has been educated, and that it would be a step in a backward direction if you deprive the small boy of the inalienable right to go up against the big boy and learn how. [Applause.] If there is anything that contributes to the manliness of the youth of this country, it is the disposition on the part of these young

men to withstand the oppression, dictation, and domination of those who may be their superior, either in size or in years, and to exercise and demand and, as far as my experience and recollection goes, to get by reason of the very team action and team play that the advocates of this proposition exploit so much the things that they want at the expense of the bigger, stronger, and domineering boy.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, when this question first came before the Committee on Appropriations I was in full sympathy with the view which is taken by the committee to-day; but, differing from the rest of the committee, I have changed my mind, and I believe that it is because I have investigated the question and have advanced, and the rest of the committee have not, whereas, of course their opinion is just the reverse. I quite sympathize with the argument just made by the gentleman. I grew up in the country, and when this question first came before us I said it was absurd to buy playgrounds and to have supervisors over the children. As he said, I thought it was good that the small boy should run up against the big boy. In the country, where there is plenty of room, and where they know each other, there is fair play, and the boys will insist upon it, and all have an equal chance; but I have come to believe that in a big city, where there are gangs of toughs and hoodlums—I believe that it is necessary that the city provide playgrounds for them, and that in order to make those playgrounds effective, you must have somebody to look after both the small boys and the big boys, and particularly to guard the girls and the small children, and therefore I have changed my original belief, and I think that we ought to provide in the city of Washington playgrounds, and if we are going to provide them, we ought also to maintain and supervise them. Why, the gentleman said that Washington had 51 per cent of streets, and he thinks children ought to play in the streets. I do not believe paved streets in a big city are any place to play. Congress has already admitted that by providing playgrounds, so that the question now is, Shall we make these playgrounds useless or useful? Last year the citizens of Washington—whom the gentleman criticises so much—and the children themselves raised \$16,000 to carry on the playgrounds and make them useful, and now the question is, Shall the Congress, shall the District itself, maintain them, or shall we leave them to the private contributions of the city of Washington? I believe that the experience of this country proves that we ought to adopt this amendment.

I believe that inasmuch as all the cities that have tried this playground system have gone on and continued it, we ought not to imagine that we know better than the teachings of experience. All over the country the large cities have recognized the necessity of playgrounds, and where they have them they recognize that it is necessary to have somebody to supervise the play. Why, you say you are teaching them to play. Of course if you put out a few children and they have plenty of space to themselves they do not need any teachers. They learn themselves. But when you have a playground which is open to all the children of all ages, you have to have somebody to arrange who shall have different parts of the grounds, what aged children shall be here and what there, and when you have little children you have got to have sand piles for them and somebody to supervise them. Lately, I understand, there have been three cities which did not have supervision where they had to shut up the playgrounds because they found they were doing more harm than good to the children. They find that supervision is necessary, and it seems to me that for us to stand up and assume that because we did not need it in our childhood, living, as I presume most of us did, fortunately, in the country, because we did not need supervision of our sports, it does not follow that in this age of great cities and of congested streets we can apply our experience to the conditions of to-day. We can afford to be liberal; we can not afford to be niggardly in anything which promotes the healthy development of children on whom depends the whole future of the country.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. As I understand it, the gentleman stated they had to have sand piles?

Mr. GILLET. The small children have piles of sand in which to play.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And you are going to haul sand to make sand piles over these playgrounds?

Mr. GILLET. Why, yes; the small children have got to have something of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, underlying the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] is a proposition of government bigger than the question of whether

we shall spend \$15,000 more of the people's money or not. I, perhaps, stand alone in this House in my political philosophy—a philosophy that I might say is only represented by Herbert Spencer, who is dead, and myself, who am more or less anemic; but notwithstanding this minority position I have felt the subject of sufficient importance to present what I believe to be the opposite view to that presented by the proponents of these amendments. Spencer suggests this question as a dominant one that should engage the mind of every politician, using that unfortunate word in its higher and purer sense:

What type of social structure am I tending to produce?

That is the proposition that I think should concern this House. What type of social structure are we tending to produce by legislating as proposed? I am city bred, born in the heart of a large city about the size of Washington. My experience as a child, therefore, is of city conditions and of city conditions somewhat congested. When I am told that it is necessary to supervise the play of children in order to enable them to play, I am told something that is in direct conflict with my experience as a child. When I am told that it is necessary to prevent the big boys from overrunning the small boys, I recall how, as a small boy, I organized enough small boys to whip the big boys. And it is that tendency, it is that self-development, that taking care of one's self which has been a marked characteristic of American boys and American men, and which has served to make the fiber, the moral backbone, of this great Nation.

I do not want to see it undermined by a pampering system imported from abroad. I am perfectly willing to vote to create open-air spaces where they are necessary. I am even willing, in the interest of the child and of the poor, to go a step beyond where my judgment might lead me and supply equipment for play, but when I am told that it is necessary to employ instructors at a higher rate than we pay those who teach the mind of a child, to superintend their play, and that otherwise playgrounds are useless, I am unable to agree and am unwilling to vote the money. We have in my city playgrounds. The statement was made in the playgrounds association bulletin, and there is a very aggressive and forceful group of people pushing this project, that in some cities the playgrounds had to be closed because of a failure to supervise them, and it was claimed that this was true in the city of Louisville. I made some inquiry. If it be so, I was unable to find it out. It certainly escaped the knowledge of myself and those others to whom I spoke.

Now, every argument made here to-day has been a begging of the question. There has been the statement that in this city it has been done and found profitable, and therefore in this other city it should be done, and therefore in this the Capital of the Nation. And the very argument illustrates the danger of this kind of legislation. Once create an official class, whose life is dependent upon the continuation of a particular governmental policy, and you turn every energy of that class to a continuance and enlargement of that policy. There is not a person employed by this Playground Association to-day who is not an advocate spending a large part of his time in trying to promote this scheme. The great mass of the public are unorganized. When you oppose to an unorganized body a few insistent organized people, the result is always in favor of the organization. As a result of this persistent advocacy of this question, we have had an extension of the work based on efforts of its friends rather than on its merits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is what has happened in this particular instance. Why, in the last week we have had people here giving lectures in regard to this matter to influence the action of Congress, presenting but one side of the case; and doing this, why? Because every one of them, with a very few exceptions, are themselves beneficiaries of the system they desire to promote. Yet, upon their statement, we are expected to continue and enlarge. I will join the gentleman from New York, if it becomes necessary, to create more air space here. But there is not a city, in my recollection of the cities of this country—and I have been in most of them of any size—that has more ground, open-air space, and pure air than the city of Washington. It is not simply because of the houses and grounds and buildings, but it is also because of the purposes to which the houses are put. There are practically no manufactories in the District of Columbia. There is no contamination of the air. There is no need for open spaces in order to enable the people

to get out where they can breathe fresh air, which would be the condition in places like Chicago and New York; and yet, notwithstanding that fact, there has been a warfare concentrated here at the Nation's capital. If we act, what is the result? They go to some other city. "Why," they say, "the United States Government has inaugurated this policy in the District of Columbia, and therefore you must inaugurate it;" and each step is made the basis for another step.

In conclusion, let me again say: As one bred in a city, who took some part as a small boy—some rather rough part as a small boy in that city—I want to protest against the idea that it is necessary to appoint teachers to teach children to play and take care of them while they are playing. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with a good deal that the gentleman from Kentucky has stated. I do not believe in the lobbying system which is used in so many cases, and probably in this case. But, Mr. Chairman, after all we are confronted with the proposition as to what we shall do. Last year this House passed a bill prohibiting children of the District of Columbia from working, and now it is suggested by the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations that we shall not even permit them to play.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest, let them play, in order to make their play work—not supervise them.

Mr. MANN. I would not call that a question, although I am always glad to yield to my friend from Kentucky. There is no place in Washington to play, unless some place is provided; there is nothing to play with, unless something is provided. The gentleman from Kentucky may imagine the children can play without teaching. They can not. The young children, without meeting with the older children, will never know anything in regard to it; not one of them. They learn from meeting with the older children; and you can not play without something to play with. Can they provide swings, can they provide any of the mechanical implements now provided for children playing in the private homes in Washington? No. Now, it has been argued by gentlemen in favor—

Mr. SHERLEY. Does my friend think it is necessary to have a teacher to teach children to swing?

Mr. MANN. It is absolutely necessary to teach children to swing, for somebody, some older person, one who has already learned how to swing, to teach the child to swing properly.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. MANN. Certainly; I will always permit the gentleman from Arkansas to interrupt me.

Mr. MACON. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: Who taught the first child to swing? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Well, I desire to say that so far as my knowledge has been Adam never learned to swing.

Mr. MACON. Who taught the first child to swing?

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that these playgrounds are only provided in cities of dense population; and it is because of that suggestion, made so often here to-day and so often before in the House, I take the floor now. I represent a district in no part of it to any extent as thickly populated as the districts in the city of Washington. I think there is no place in my district where the population is so dense as it is on an average in the city of Washington.

It is a district wholly metropolitan, in the sense of being in the city limits of the city of Chicago. We have in my district about 1,200 acres of parks and playgrounds. We have 10 parks used for playgrounds, and last year in these playgrounds, not all in my district, but all on the south side in the city of Chicago, and a large share of them in my district—many in the districts represented by the gentlemen from Chicago [Mr. WILSON and Mr. McDERMOTT]—we have 148 free tennis courts, 24 free baseball diamonds, 25 football grounds, 1,723 booths in free bathing pools, 114 shower baths for men, 118 shower baths for women. They have bicycle tracks and various other things. Now, are these made use of?

[The time of Mr. MANN having expired, by unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BENNET of New York, it was extended ten minutes.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on the south side, in the city of Chicago, in a district not as thickly populated as Washington, in these playgrounds last year 279,000 and odd people made use of the indoor gymnasium, 900,000 people made use of the shower baths, 2,164,000 people made use of the outdoor gymnasium, 654,000 made use of the swimming pool, 135,000 made use of the assembly halls and various other provisions, and a total of 5,195,500 people made use of these different provisions.

Mr. VREELAND. You do not mean people. You mean visits by an unknown number of people?

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I mean that this is the number of times that people made use of these provisions, and I do not include mere visitors who looked on or those who came with their children. I include only those who actually made use of the various facilities.

Mr. VREELAND. The point I wish to bring out is that instead of being 5,000,000 people who visited these baths, or whatever they were, it may have been 100,000 people who visited them a great many times.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I use the common language of statisticians. If the gentleman does not understand that, I will be glad to explain it.

Mr. VREELAND. I do not think the gentleman is trying to deceive the committee.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, has this proved a benefit, or not? Following the provision originally for the playgrounds there, the people paying all the taxes themselves, they have insisted that playgrounds should be provided where they are needed in other parts of that territory, and only recently three new playgrounds have been laid out in three different parts of my district, in not one of which is there a tributary population to the extent of 10,000 persons.

Is it necessary to provide these playgrounds? Oh, well, I suppose that children would live, most of them, if they had no playgrounds. Most of them would live for a time at least if they were all raised in flat buildings, although the buildings around these playgrounds in the main are not flat buildings.

Mr. VREELAND, Mr. BOWERS, and Mr. COX of Indiana rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. To either charmer.

Mr. BOWERS. The gentleman speaks of the payment of taxes. Will the gentleman insist that the proportion of taxes paid by the residents of this District is absolutely equitable under the circumstances?

Mr. MANN. Oh, if the gentleman raises the question whether the Government of the United States should pay half the expenses of the District of Columbia out of the General Treasury, I do not propose to discuss that question, although I am inclined to think that it is a perfectly fair division.

Mr. BOWERS. But the gentleman seems to lay special stress on the proposition that the taxes were paid by the people and that they demanded this particular thing. Now, will the gentleman permit me to call his attention to the fact that in this theoretical distribution of the burden, in order to saddle one-half of the burden on the Government, it is necessary to charge the Government with the ownership of all of the streets, of all of the open spaces, of all of the parks, of all of the public utilities, of all of the things necessary to the life of any municipality that are exempt from taxation everywhere else in the world, except in so far as they are estimated as the property of the United States in the matter of the fiscal system of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman never has and never will hear me shirk my position as to whether the Government ought to pay one-half of the taxes of the District. I have been familiar with the hypocrisy of that statement for years.

Mr. VREELAND. The gentleman's discussion seems to be largely along the line of the necessity of providing playgrounds, and he cites the city of Chicago as an instance. The question before the committee is whether the increased appropriation shall be made for supervision and employees and maintenance of playgrounds, which means at least 100 teachers for supervision and attending the children. I would be glad to hear the gentleman discuss and give us the experience of the city of Chicago, as to whether there is a necessity, after adopting the policy of providing playgrounds, having provided 14 municipal playgrounds already, whether this large amount of money is necessary for the supervision of those playgrounds?

Mr. MANN. I will read the gentleman my opinion on that subject:

Educators, social workers, playground supervisors and directors are all agreed that a playground system without a definite plan of operation is little better than no playgrounds. The plan of operation, however, can be no better or larger than those who are intrusted to execute the plans. Nowhere has it been found enough to furnish space and equipment and leave the use of these to the people without expert supervision. This seems to be true, even where the space and equipment have been selected with the most careful reference to the play instincts and tendencies of the groups of varying ages.

A public playground system is peculiarly an institution wherein a great deal or a very little efficient work may be done with the general appearances being the same in either case. Hence the necessity for careful selection of playground workers, study of hours of work in relation to efficiency, and a plan of schooling which shall insure growth

of vision, resourcefulness, and strength on the part of those who plan and execute the work. Good results of a positive character can only be secured when all of these factors are considered and acted upon wisely. Therefore frequent conferences are held among the instructors, study courses are followed, and special investigations are conducted with reference to making the workers and playground system more efficient and more useful to the community.

Mr. Chairman, I was at one time in charge of a gymnasium myself as expert director. It would be folly to tell me that a man can go into a gymnasium and through his own knowledge there treat himself physically or learn the things that he wishes to learn. No man of good judgment will take a treatment or practice in a gymnasium without expert direction, and no set of children can profitably and to the best advantage use the implements that are provided for them to play without expert direction. Do we give expert direction to our children at home? Certainly, we attempt to. I have kept house in the city of Washington for a number of years, with one boy who is past the age of living here. There never has been a time or a place in Washington where he could properly play. Time and again has he complained to me because policemen warned them off the parks, because policemen warned them off the sidewalks, because policemen warned them off the streets. Where would he play, he used to say—"Where can we play?"

Mr. VREELAND. Play what?

Mr. MANN. Anything.

Mr. BOWERS. Did the gentleman's boy attempt to play on the sidewalk, or did he go to the gymnasium in the school in which his boy and my boy were both pupils and both members of the same athletic association?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's boy and my boy did not confine themselves to either place. But they ought to be permitted to have some place where they can go and play. Why, gentlemen of the committee, talk about economy, as has the gentleman from Tennessee. We propose to expend fifteen or twenty million dollars for the purpose of building battle ships to kill people, and then refuse to expend \$15,000 to save the lives of our children. [Applause.] I am willing to practice economy at the proper time and the proper place, but for God's sake commence economy on somebody else besides the children of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania was recognized.

Mr. VREELAND. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VREELAND. Is it proper at this time to make a motion to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is in order at any time, but the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VREELAND. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania withhold a moment until I can make a motion to close debate? I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendment thereto be closed in twenty-five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor, unless he yields.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman. With a great deal of the position taken by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] I agree, particularly with that portion relative to the supervision. I do not, however, believe that the proposition before the House at this time involves the question of supervision.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. We can easily determine that by inquiring of the proposer whether he would be willing to accept an amendment limiting the money to equipment.

Mr. MANN. And will the gentleman be willing to accept the proposition if he accepts that?

Mr. BOWERS. If you limit it to a reasonable amount; yes.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. As I understand this proposition, it has very little to do with supervision. I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky that supervision is not of so much importance, that children should have playgrounds where they can exert their own individual rights without the intervention or supervision of others; but in our city conditions large numbers of children congregate on the playgrounds, and it is not a question of supervision to the extent of directing the children how and what they shall play, but a question of supervision to the extent of permitting each of the children that may be there to exercise his own individual rights to play, and to that extent I believe in supervision.

The conditions in our city life are considerably different from the conditions in our country life. I was raised in the country, unlike the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. There we have conditions that are more nearly natural than we have in the cities, and under natural conditions give the child the time to play and he will find his own implements for play and his

own method of play; but in our city life it is different. We have artificial conditions. The natural conditions for playing that exist in the country do not exist in the city, and even when you have provided the playground there is not the same natural condition for play and for physical development that goes with that play that you have in your country life. It becomes necessary to do something more than to provide playgrounds. We have, as I understand it, already provided the playgrounds. Now, it is necessary for us to do more, and that is to provide the means of utilizing those playgrounds with the implements necessary to play with, and the proposition of the committee is that it provide for maintenance and equipment of those playgrounds the paltry sum of \$1,500, and we are asked to economize to that extent because of the great expenditure on the part of the Government; and, incidentally, it is asserted that the people of the District of Columbia do not pay all of the taxes as they pay in other cities. As a matter of fact we are the parties who are responsible for the system of taxation in the District of Columbia, and if the system of taxation is not just, is not equitable, then we should remedy that system and make it just and make it equitable; but we should not use it as a means and a weapon of preventing the proper equipment of playgrounds for the people in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BOWERS. Do the people of the District want the system changed? Would they like to have universal suffrage?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Some of them would and some of them would not.

Mr. VREELAND. I want to know if the gentleman knew that in the last year's appropriation the people representing this movement asked for \$1,500 for implements for children to play with, on the representation that that was sufficient to equip them? Now they come back, and we are giving them another \$1,500 for the same purpose.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. As a matter of fact, however, the information is in the hands of the committee to the effect that \$1,500 provided last year for that purpose was not sufficient, and that the citizens of this city contributed out of their own purses some \$16,000 or \$18,000 for that purpose.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman be willing to confine his advocacy and his activities to the matter of equipping these grounds, without reference to the maintenance of these grounds by some teacher who will tell the boy whether he shall shoot from taw or from past?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I am perfectly willing to confine my activities in this matter to an argument in favor of the maintenance and equipment of the playgrounds, with a supervision that will not permit the supervisor to determine what particular play the boy shall engage in.

Mr. BOWERS. And the gentleman's proposition is as deep as a well and as broad as a church door.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, debate on this subject has been quite general. It seems to me nearly every phase has been traversed, and I move that all debate upon the paragraph and pending amendments thereto close in fifteen minutes.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman consent that the time shall be equally divided between those in favor of the amendment and those in favor of the provision as carried in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will state that that can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. VREELAND. There are two members of the subcommittee who have not been heard.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will extend the time to twenty minutes.

Mr. PARSONS. I ask unanimous consent that the twenty minutes be divided equally between the two sides.

Mr. VREELAND. I object to that, as there are several members of the subcommittee who have not spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that that will naturally be done by the Chair. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that debate on the pending paragraph and on amendments thereto close in twenty minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this body for ten years, and never during my experience here have I witnessed as much misapprehension with reference to the facts pertinent to the subject-matter under discussion. Time and time again here have we heard Members exclaim, "If we fail to act, where shall the children play?" One gentleman suggests that the city is covered with signs of "Keep off the grass." Another gentleman says that the public parks and all other reservations are closed to the children. Another says

that the police officials are driving the children from all public squares, circles, and triangles, and that they have, in fact, no place to play. Now, what are the facts? Why, instead of all these assertions being correct, the exact contrary is the truth. Not only have the children of the District of Columbia the right to play in public parks and other reservations, but the law specifically directs that the officer in charge of these public parks and reservations shall lay out thereon playgrounds for the children.

Now, Mr. Chairman, does any gentleman here question the statement I have made? If he does, I have the law before me and can read it in substantiation of my assertion. But, gentlemen, that is not the issue. We are not discussing now the proposition as to whether the children of the District shall have playgrounds; that issue is not involved in the amendment of the gentleman from New York. The question now being considered is, Shall we swell this appropriation for maintenance and supervision of playgrounds already provided from \$1,500 to \$15,000? Now, Mr. Chairman, the inquiry naturally arises, and it is quite pertinent, What will be done with this \$15,000 if we adopt the proposed amendment and vote it into this bill? Mr. Chairman, I have always thought that a safe rule to govern our conduct upon a given proposition is to look to the past and, seeing what has happened, let it serve as a guide as to what will take place in the future. Now, let us see what has been done with the money heretofore appropriated for the purposes contemplated in the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Let me show you. Mr. Chairman, the first appropriation for this purpose by the Congress was three years ago, and the item carried \$2,000 for maintenance and equipment of playgrounds. Note that it was for maintenance and equipment.

And yet, Mr. Chairman \$700 of this sum was diverted from the purpose for which it was appropriated and used for supervision, for the payment of salaries of these so-called "teachers," who have been so frequently alluded to. They are not teachers in any sense of the word, as I shall show before I conclude. Seven hundred dollars of the sum appropriated for maintenance and equipment was used, not for that purpose, but for supervision. The next appropriation—

Mr. PARSONS. If the gentleman will permit, you say the appropriation two years ago was \$2,000.

Mr. BURLESON. No; the first appropriation, three years ago, was for \$2,000. I know what I am talking about, and I beg to assure my friend that every statement I shall make is literally founded upon fact. The next appropriation—or the second—was for \$10,000; and here it was that these gentlemen, these professional philanthropists—and I do not like to impute bad motives to people, especially for deeds apparently good; but, Mr. Chairman, the interest manifested here in the lengthy discussion of this comparatively trivial item on this bill makes it manifest that there is a propaganda behind it, an active combination of persons pressing it. This interest has manifested itself, as the gentleman from Kentucky has said, through the columns of the local press. These persons are trying to promote the success of this particular scheme or fad, have lectured and written and petitioned, in order to make an impression upon the minds of Congressmen, with a view of securing this appropriation provided in this amendment.

If they succeed, it is one step toward what they hope will ultimately lead, if they can have their way, to the expenditure of a million dollars by the District and General Government for the acquisition of playgrounds in this city. But to return, the second appropriation secured was, as I have said, for \$10,000 for maintenance, supervision, and equipment of playgrounds. The next and third was \$5,000 for maintenance, supervision, and equipment, the three aggregating \$17,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, what became of the money? These people are now asking for \$15,000. Before we give it let us see what became of the \$17,000. Oh, the gentleman from Illinois asks, with tears in his voice, if not in his eyes, "Will you practice economy at the expense of our children?" And he appeals to this body not to deny the children this pitiful sum. Well, I am not inclined to deny the children of Washington any sum which can and will be used for their benefit. But, Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to shut off the people who have been the beneficiaries of these appropriations heretofore made for these purposes. How much do you suppose the children, the poor children that the gentleman from Illinois wails about, got of this \$17,000? How much of it went for maintenance and equipment? How much of it went for playthings? Permit me to give you the figures taken from the record. Of the \$17,000, \$10,369.77 went in the way of salaries to these people who are lecturing and writing and petitioning in support of this—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may have time to conclude his remarks.

Mr. PARSONS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The temporary occupant of the chair has informed the Chairman that the time for debate on this proposition has been limited to twenty minutes.

Mr. BOWERS. If the Chair rules that the request is out of order, I ask that the gentleman's time may be extended for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That would consume the entire twenty minutes.

Mr. BOWERS. A request for unanimous consent is always in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi, as the Chair understands, asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for ten minutes, the time not to come out of the time of twenty minutes.

Mr. BOWERS. That is my request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, of these first three appropriations made, as I have just said, \$10,369.77 went for supervision, to those who drew salaries as supervisors. Oh, Mr. Chairman, it would be too bad to deny the children a continuation of these appropriations! Remember, gentlemen, conditions are entirely different in the city of Washington from those obtaining in the city of New York or the city of Chicago or any other city in the United States. There are no conditions of congestion here, no vast areas covered by sky scrapers like those to be found in New York or Chicago. Yet, notwithstanding this, these interested philanthropists were not deterred from coming forward with their plans for reaching into the Treasury. After the first two appropriations had been secured their plans began to develop.

It was then, under the persuasive presentation of these gentlemen, who had been largely the beneficiaries of this \$17,000, that their scheme developed and was laid before the Committee on Appropriations, disclosing the fact that they ultimately intended to ask for playgrounds covering the entire area of this city and calling for, as I have shown, an ultimate expenditure, approximately, of \$1,000,000. If they succeed, what would become the annual fixed charge on this Government and the District? How much would it then take? If it took \$10,369, out of an appropriation of \$17,000, to supervise a few playgrounds, how much would our constituents have to go down into their pockets and put into the coffers of this District in order to meet the requirements of these gentlemen who hoped to supervise a vast number of playgrounds? How much? How much?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] confuses this item, which he seeks to amend, with an item that was stricken out of the bill. This item in the estimate carried originally \$25,000 for the supervision, maintenance, and equipment of these playgrounds—municipal playgrounds—and on page 117 of the original draft of this bill we found there was an estimate of \$8,400 and also \$1,500 for supervision, equipment, and maintenance of school playgrounds. This was for the summer months. We struck it out. There is a difference between the municipal playgrounds and the school playgrounds. There has arisen a controversy in this city between those who want to control all the playgrounds and the local school authorities. Both want to control the school playgrounds.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman kindly say to what appropriation he is alluding when he says there was a separate appropriation for the school playgrounds?

Mr. BURLESON. I did not say appropriation. I said estimate. Look at your Book of Estimates and you will find it.

Mr. PARSONS. But under this appropriation all this money could go for the school playgrounds as well as the municipal playgrounds, could it not?

Mr. BURLESON. Oh, I do not know. In the light of the fact that a former appropriation for this purpose has been diverted, I doubt not that they could use it or would try to use it for just such purposes as they saw fit. But under the item playgrounds, where we have provided for the municipal playgrounds heretofore, if I may so term them, was this estimate of \$25,000, and it is this estimate that we cut down to \$1,500. Why? Because, after your committee, going into the matter carefully, reached the deliberate conclusion that no larger sum should be appropriated, the House passed upon and approved this sum, namely, \$1,500 last year. You decided last year that these playgrounds could be equipped for this sum, and the item was embodied in last year's bill and passed by you and is now

a law, appropriating \$1,500 "for completing the equipment of outdoor playgrounds."

Now, is it possible that a larger sum is needed? Take the figures that I have given, appropriations for the three years, and say that every dollar not used for supervision was used for equipment. Ten thousand, in round figures, was eaten up by the supervisors. This would leave \$7,000 of the first three appropriations for equipment, and then add \$1,500 appropriated last year, which would make \$8,500 used for equipment. Now, Mr. Chairman, shall we, as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS], appropriate \$15,000 to renew an equipment that originally cost only \$8,500 and has been used for only one or two years? That is the position that these gentlemen have placed themselves in, and they can not possibly escape it. Mr. Chairman, there is no disposition on the part of any member of your committee to deny any child in the District of Columbia an opportunity to play, but your committee does feel that the trend of such appropriations like this contended for by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] is paternalistic and socialistic and should not be encouraged. In this District we provide not only free schools, but free text-books, free writing paper, free ink, free pens, and also free sewing materials to be used in the sewing schools. In fact, the entire equipment of the public schools is furnished free.

Everything is free from the time a child enters the kindergarten up to the time he graduates from the business high school. And these gentlemen of socialistic leanings, not content with this, now come and say you must keep the leading strings on the child, not alone in the school but even when he is on the playground. I ask the question that I asked last year when we were discussing this same item: In God's name, will some one tell me where the lesson of self-reliance is to be learned by a child in the District of Columbia? You keep the spoon of governmental pap in his mouth from the time he enters the kindergarten until he graduates a man, and if you take this step now, and coddle him and supervise him and direct him and manage him when he is on the playground, where is he to learn the lesson of self-reliance that makes for sturdy Americanism and self-reliant American citizenship?

Mr. Chairman, one word more and I am done. The District of Columbia contains more open squares, more public reservations for breathing places than any other city in the world. The engineer commissioner estimates 51 per cent of the entire city is devoted to such purposes. The gentleman from New York said a moment ago that it is 59 per cent. Last year I had a letter from the engineer commissioner—

Mr. VREELAND. Fifty-nine per cent. I read from the estimate made in the letter you refer to.

Mr. BURLESON. I am mistaken, and I beg the pardon of the gentleman. I had written a letter to the engineer commissioner, asking him how much open space have we in Washington that can be used for playgrounds, and he figured that 59 per cent of the entire area is probably used for public purposes.

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman think that the streets are proper places for children to play?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT (continuing). For it applies to the streets.

Mr. BURLESON. Yes; the streets are a proper place for children to play in the residential portion of this city. I lived on New Hampshire avenue and N street NW. for five years. I had small children who played on that street. I lived on the corner of Seventeenth and N streets NW., one block from Scott Circle and Massachusetts avenue, for four years, and all the children played on the streets. Mr. Chairman, why not? There is not one vehicle that will pass along those streets in an hour. There is no reason why they should not play on the streets.

Gentlemen, the sole purpose of this amendment is to obtain a foothold. I do not like to criticize the people of this District—I know some good people are interested in this appropriation—but why should we now, the very first time that a spirit of charity or public spirit manifests itself on the part of the District people, chill it by saying to them by such appropriation as is asked here, "You shall not do anything for yourselves?"

The gentleman from New York and the proponents of this proposition say that the people of Washington have come forward and generously raised fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars to be used for the playgrounds. It is the first evidence of civic pride that I have seen manifest itself since I have been in Washington. The wellwishers of these good people should hesitate a long time before they discourage its development. Let us permit it to grow, rather than promptly take the step which would suppress it. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, how many minutes are there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes are remaining, five minutes to be occupied by those opposed to the amendment and ten minutes by those in favor.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I dislike to occupy any time in a discussion of this amendment, and yet it is due to say that the subcommittee framing this bill was confronted by the very serious financial condition of the District. As was stated yesterday—and I may say it is not that I would not like the committee to give all that is asked, but the committee has its own limitations. The estimates carried nearly \$4,000,000 more than the possible revenue. The law provides that the debt of \$4,184,000 shall be paid, beginning with the 1st of July next, in the five ensuing years. That means that this committee, aside from the \$975,000 it pays on the funded debt, shall pay \$823,000 plus \$83,000 interest this year, making over \$900,000 on the unfunded debt.

Gentlemen, that was the law that the committee had to face in framing this bill. As your servants, we feel ourselves bound to obey the law and seek to carry out that which you had purposed to do. It has been the intent of the committee not to make any appropriations except where they seemed to be absolutely necessary. They talk about education of childhood. One of the great lessons to be taught in childhood is to pay your honest debts, and the city has made its own agreement with the Federal Government and your committee is called on to carry it out.

Another thing. There is no harmony in carrying out the playground scheme. It is a double-headed institution—a municipal and a school board. To show that I am not mistaken about this let me read what one of the members of the school board says:

It is, I think, the opinion of the board of directors of the Playgrounds Association, of which I am a member, as well as of the board of education, that these school playgrounds shall be under the sole charge of the board of education. It is public property, and it should be under our charge.

Again—

The Citizens' Association are of the opinion that it should come directly under the board of education, and they believe it would be better for us, because now it is a divided control and it is unsatisfactory, and the board of education feel that they should have the direction of it.

That it is the property of both the municipal and the school board associations.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest to him that this same person from whose testimony he is reading stated to me since then, and since these hearings have been had by the subcommittee, that there has been a resolution passed by the Citizens' Association stating that they are in entire harmony.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. This same party says that they "have had constant trouble."

Mr. GILLETT. But he says that they have now come to an entire agreement.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is since the hearings. It is the opinion of the committee that no great harm will come if this matter can be held in abeyance. The grounds are equipped as school grounds. The worn-out equipment can be replaced by the appropriation. No great harm can possibly come to the childhood and youth of the District by letting this matter rest in abeyance until those who propose to expend the money shall themselves devise some plan wherein they can work in harmony and get the best results with the money appropriated.

Mr. BOWERS. May I ask my friend who would administer this money if it was appropriated?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The gentleman knows as well as I.

Mr. BOWERS. I do not know, I confess, and I ask the gentleman. I do not think he knows.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If I may be allowed to answer, it would be intrusted to the District commissioners, who will appoint a board charged with its expenditure.

Mr. MANN. We can not turn this money over under this provision.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Wait a moment. Where and to whom do they make a report of the money? It must be to the commissioners, if at all.

Mr. GILLETT. How do they get this money? The commissioners have the money, have they not?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I am so advised.

Mr. MANN. The commissioners of the District?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Mr. NYE. In favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NYE. It is certainly impossible for me in the time which I am allowed to say what I should like to say upon this, to me, important question.

In a moment of time this Congress appropriated \$800,000 for the sufferers in Italy. Certainly I do not complain of that, although I think in prudence and wisdom we might have limited it to \$500,000. But to-day we are spending hours to guard against a possible extravagance in a matter which goes to the very vitals of this Republic, which concerns the tenderest ties of home and the things most sacred to our people.

Three hundred and twenty thousand children took advantage of these grounds last summer under a wise, wholesome, and, I think, proper supervision by those who, in a spirit of philanthropy, sought to improve the conditions of our children. Who will say that these playgrounds and these exercises are not a part of education under our modern system of the development of children? Who will say that it is unnecessary that the thousands of poor children in the city shall have the advantages which these grounds that we have purchased afford under a wise supervision?

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. NYE. I have not time or I should be glad to.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman advise us where he gets his figures as to the 320,000 children?

Mr. NYE. I will. I do not wish to encroach upon the time of the gentleman who has charge of this amendment.

Mr. BOWERS. I think the committee, which is always willing—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. NYE. I will try to state my authority.

Mr. BOWERS. I was going to say that I think the committee, which is always willing to hear from the gentleman, would gladly extend him time.

Mr. NYE. I hold in my hand a circular published by the Playgrounds Association, which, by the way, as I am informed by its president, is an incorporated association.

Mr. BOWERS. Is the gentleman advised of the fact that the probable population of the city is about 320,000? Does he want to reduce them all to the condition of children?

Mr. NYE. I was about to give the gentleman an answer as to the authority which I have. I stated that this Playgrounds Association was an incorporated body. Its officials are among the best citizens of Washington, and the superintendent and officials have placed in the hands of some Members this circular which states that the aggregate attendance for eleven weeks last summer was 320,000 as against 240,000 for the summer of 1906.

Mr. BOWERS. That is multiplied by every day in the week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, in view of the attention that was given to the gentleman from Texas and the interruption of the gentleman from Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota have three minutes more, not to come out of the twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota be allowed to proceed for three minutes, not to be taken out of the twenty minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYE. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is really parsimony that is manifested by the opposition. I have the utmost confidence and respect for the judgment of this committee. I know that they have acted according to their best judgment, but this amendment is before the committee, and we have a right to give our individual views upon the subject.

Some of us believe that the children of this city should be looked after first. I know the necessity of economy. I believe in it, and in many cases, as a new Member, I have voted contrary to my party and contrary to the majority on various appropriation bills. But we have this property, we have these grounds, and it stands to reason that a decent supervision which shall secure an orderly control of the children and their development should be provided. I think there is no question but

what the amount asked for by this amendment is a reasonable one, and I do not think we are making any mistake in supporting the measure. I think we can afford to lean a little toward extravagance, even if it be extravagance, when it comes to dealing with the future of children in the city of Washington. I am aware that I have taken all the time I ought to, and I thank the gentlemen of the committee for the opportunity to say a word. [Applause.]

Mr. PARSONS. How much time is there remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. PARSONS. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE].

Mr. BEDE. Mr. Chairman, so far as the financial side of this question is concerned, I do not wish to discuss it, because I think the committee is much more competent to deal with that part of the argument. If this question referred only to Democrats and boll weevils and other products of Texas, I would leave it entirely to the gentleman from Texas. [Laughter.] But as it refers to children—and I have some of those innocent products in my family—I think I have a right to speak.

It depends altogether upon what you think and what you believe about the conduct of children. I never have known a family of 10 or 15 children like my own [laughter] that could be turned out into the nursery without a governess. If there is any man in this House with that sort of a family that he can turn out without a governess, he ought to vote against this appropriation; but if he believes in a governess for the nursery, he ought to give a governess to the playgrounds in this Capital City.

I once had a lady friend who had about 20 children. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. PARSONS. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes, not to come out of the twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes, not to come out of the twenty minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEDE. This lady friend had about 20 children. She was a married woman. [Laughter.] She believed in the administration policy, and her home was by the side of a river. A stranger came by, stopped for a drink at the well, and in talking with the lady of the house expressed the thought that it was a very dangerous place for a family to live that had so many children. The lady said:

Oh, no; it is not so very dangerous; we have only lost 3 within the last twenty years.

[Laughter.]

Now, it depends upon how precious you consider the children whether you want the governess or not. It is not a question of playgrounds; we have appropriated for that. It is a question whether you want to turn loose all the children of the District of Columbia, not to play leap frog, as my good friend from Tennessee has said, but to attack each other in the different games in which they are engaged. My own personal experience in raising 15 or 20 children is that they need a little supervision. We have not got enough secret service men to turn over to that business. [Laughter.] I do not know as they would be competent if we had them. I believe the home life of a nation will stand up for governesses in the home and in the public playground of this great Capital. [Applause.]

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, last year \$18,000 was expended in connection with the equipment and supervision and maintenance of the playgrounds in the city of Washington, and of that \$16,500 was contributed by the people of the city of Washington and only \$1,500 from the appropriations. That \$18,000, roughly, was expended as follows: For improvements, \$5,000; for equipment, \$3,000; for supervision, \$10,000. My amendment asks that the District assume the burden itself. It may be that there are Members who think from their own experience that supervision is not necessary, but I submit that when an association going out to raise money finds it necessary to expend \$10,000 of the \$18,000 it can raise in supervision, that is prima facie proof that supervision is necessary. It was called to my attention by a Member of the House who had taught school that every school-teacher in recesses, when the children are playing, is supposed to supervise their play. I just want to read a summary in an article showing the results of an investigation made of juvenile delinquency in

Chicago in connection with the effect of playgrounds there, and this is the summary:

To sum up the case for the small parks, the playgrounds in the large parks as well: A small park neighborhood recreation center such as those on the south side of Chicago can be expected to be coincident with a 28½ per cent decrease of delinquency within a radius of one-half mile, conditions of the neighborhood in other respects remaining stable. To provide a probation district with adequate play facilities is coincident with a reduction in delinquency of from 28 per cent to 70 per cent, or 44 per cent as an average. In addition, over a much larger area the small parks have a tendency to decrease delinquency 17 per cent.

I say we need supervision so that all the children can use the playgrounds, and I say that by providing proper facilities and using the playgrounds that we already have in the proper ways we can tremendously decrease the amount of delinquencies.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DOUGLAS] offered an amendment appropriating \$7,000. I hope that amendment will be voted down, and that those who are in favor of proper supervision will vote for the amendment I offered, providing for \$15,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that the item as amended, if the amendment were adopted, be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

The Clerk read as follows:

So that the provision will read:
"Playgrounds: For maintenance and renewal of equipment and planting trees for outdoor playgrounds, \$15,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARDNER of Michigan) there were—ayes 69, noes 59.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan and Mr. PARSONS took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 65, noes 62.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the plans and specifications for all buildings provided for in this act shall be prepared under the supervision of the municipal architect of the District of Columbia and shall be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and shall be constructed in conformity thereto.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order or reserve it as against this paragraph. The provision for a municipal architect was stricken out of the bill yesterday.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it will be necessary to insert an amendment there, which I will offer.

Mr. MANN. Very well, I shall withdraw the point of order if the gentleman proposes to offer the necessary amendment.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 13, strike out the words "municipal architect" and insert in lieu thereof the words "inspector of buildings."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOR METROPOLITAN POLICE.

For major and superintendent, \$4,000; assistant superintendent, with rank of inspector, \$2,500; 3 inspectors, at \$1,800 each; 10 captains, at \$1,500 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, \$2,000; clerk, \$1,500; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 4 surgeons of the police and fire departments, at \$600 each; additional compensation for 20 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, \$4,800, or so much thereof as may be necessary; 12 lieutenants, one of whom shall be harbor master, at \$1,320 each; 45 sergeants, one of whom may be detailed for duty in the harbor patrol, at \$1,250 each; 482 privates of class 3, at \$1,200 each; 89 privates of class 2, at \$1,080 each; 88 privates of class 1, at \$900 each; for amount required to pay salaries of privates of class 2 who will be promoted to class 3 and privates of class 1 who will be promoted to class 2 during the fiscal year 1910, \$7,043.52; 6 telephone operators, at \$600 each; 14 janitors,

at \$600 each; messenger, \$700; messenger, \$500; major and superintendent, mounted, \$240; inspector, mounted, \$240; 55 captains, lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted, at \$240 each; 64 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted, on bicycles, at \$50 each; 26 drivers, at \$720 each; and 2 police matrons, at \$600 each; in all, \$23,513.52.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, in line 11, strike out the words "five hundred and thirteen" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five hundred and fifty-three."

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is simply to correct a total.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$4,380.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I attempted in a timid way to get the floor before the vote was taken upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York to this bill increasing the appropriation for playgrounds from \$1,500 to \$15,000, but a motion was made by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill to limit debate to twenty minutes, which cut me off; and hence I take the floor at this time for the purpose of expressing the hope that the gentleman in charge of the bill will see to it that when it is reported to the House a separate vote is demanded upon this amendment and that a roll call is had, so that the taxpayers of the country can see just who of their Representatives upon this floor are voting the money of the children away who live in the north, south, east, and west, or in whatever other part of this Union they may be domiciled, so that those children are to be burdened with extra taxation in order to furnish playgrounds to the city of Washington for the entertainment of the children who happen to reside here. It is true, sir, that it says that the city of Washington is to pay one-half of the amount, but that is not enough. It ought to pay the entire amount if it wants playgrounds, or do without them.

If this matter was intended to stop with this appropriation of \$15,000, I would not at this time take up the time of the House to oppose it, but it is only an entering wedge, in my judgment. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested by gentlemen upon the Appropriations Committee that it is only a beginning of a series of appropriations that will perhaps increase from time to time until a million dollars or more of the people's money will be improperly appropriated under the guise of furnishing playgrounds for the children of this city, but intended by many of its advocates to furnish jobs for quite a number of place hunters who are too lazy to work for a living. In plain words, Mr. Chairman, it is simply an effort on the part of some of the people who are behind this proposition to furnish money wrongfully taken from the pockets of the people in order to give jobs to a horde of persons around the city of Washington who are out of employment and ought to be put to work instead of being sent to some playground to try to teach children how to play.

I asked the gentleman from Illinois, in response to a suggestion of his "that children did not know how to play unless they were taught," who taught the first child how to play, and he responded that he did not think Adam knew how to play. Adam was never a child, as I understand it, and hence it was not necessary to teach him to play. He did not even know how to swing, for if he had I am sure he would not have been tempted by Eve, for he would have swung himself up into the tree and have gotten the apple for himself. [Laughter.]

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that you can not make a child play. You can not make him play any more than you can make a horse drink if he does not want water. You can furnish playgrounds for them, but you can not lead children to them, like you would cattle to a pasture, and make them play; they will not do it. They want to play in their own way and of their own volition. They want to play games of their own selection, and not those suggested by some other person.

Again, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen say children ought not to be allowed to play on the streets. I want to say to you, sir, that it is as natural for children to play on the streets—I do not care how many playgrounds you may have distributed around over the city—as it is for a goat to quit grass and go to the streets of a town and eat tin cans; and just as natural as it is for "Old Suke" to quit a good range and go to a town and eat the paper and rags that she finds strewn along the streets. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I insist that this effort to get playgrounds for these children is a misnomer; it is an effort to

get money to give positions to people out of employment, and who prefer play positions to work. If they are men and can not make an honest living by honest toil in the city, then they ought to be sent to the farm, where they can do so, instead of to playgrounds to teach children to play. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

For health officer, \$3,500; chief clerk and deputy health officer, \$2,200; clerk, \$1,400; 4 clerks, 2 of whom may act as sanitary and food inspectors, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; clerk, \$600; chief inspector and deputy health officer, \$1,800; 15 sanitary and food inspectors, at \$1,200 each; 1 inspector, \$1,000; 1 inspector, \$900; sanitary and food inspector, who shall be a veterinary surgeon and act as inspector of live stock and dairy farms, \$1,200; 5 sanitary and food inspectors, who shall be veterinary surgeons, at \$1,000 each; and 5 sanitary and food inspectors, at \$900 each, to assist in the enforcement of the milk and pure-food laws and the regulations relating thereto; sanitary and food inspector, who shall also inspect dairy products and shall be a practical chemist, \$1,800; messenger and janitor, \$600; driver, \$540; pound master, \$1,500; and for laborers, at not exceeding \$40 per month, \$2,400; in all, \$53,740.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of securing some information. I notice on page 63 there are provided 29 sanitary and food inspectors; on page 65 there is provided for special service in connection with the adulteration of foods and drugs \$100, and then the item below, for continued expenses in relation to the enforcement of the same law, \$1,000. May I ask what is the purpose of making these different items in these different shapes?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say in regard to that item, for which \$100 is appropriated, the purpose is, for instance, if there is a suspicion that impure candy or any article of food is adulterated or impure, to send some unknown person to get a sample in order to test it. It is a standing appropriation that may be used if necessary. It never has been abused, so far as I know.

Mr. MANN. It can not be possible that out of the 29 inspectors already provided they can find no one unknown at a store at which it is sold.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is the theory on which that has been provided.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, including personal services, of the public crematory, \$3,000.

Mr. NICHOLLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 40, under the head of "Public schools," and to insert after the provision providing for a clerk to carry out the provisions of the child-labor law an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NICHOLLS] asks unanimous consent to return to page 40 for the purpose of offering the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of appointing inspectors and enforcing the child labor law, \$2,400.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. NICHOLLS. May I ask the gentleman to withhold his objection for a minute?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the objection.

Mr. NICHOLLS. I would like to state that my information is that no inspectors have been appointed as provided for in the child-labor law passed in the last session. Section 10 of that law provides that—

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to appoint two inspectors to carry out the purposes of this act at a compensation not exceeding \$1,200 each per annum.

I have been given to understand that those inspectors have not been appointed for the reason that no appropriation was made, and I also understand that in this bill no provision is made for them at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] insist upon his objection?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I want to say that my information is that the law has been rigidly enforced and will continue to be, and therefore I must insist upon my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Police court: For 2 judges, at \$3,600 each; clerk, \$2,000; 2 deputy clerks, at \$1,500 each; 2 deputy clerks, at \$1,200 each; deputy clerk, to be known as financial clerk, \$1,500; 3 bailiffs, at \$900 each; 4 bailiffs, at \$720 each; deputy marshal, \$1,000; janitor, \$540; engineer, \$900; assistant engineer, \$720; fireman, \$360; 2 assistant janitors, at \$300 each; matron, \$600; 3 charmen, at \$360 each; in all, \$27,480.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, at the end of line 22, insert:

"For 2 inspectors to enforce the child-labor law, at \$1,200 each."

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against it and would say that they are already provided for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. I desire to make this statement, that the law already requires that two inspectors shall be appointed for the purpose of enforcing the child-labor laws in the District of Columbia. There is no provision whatsoever made in this bill, nor has there been in any previous bill, for the pay of those inspectors, and consequently a motion to amend to insert a provision for the payment of inspectors is in order.

Mr. BOWERS. Does not the gentleman know that the work has been absolutely done by men detailed from the police force, and that the law has been carried into effect?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I do not so understand it.

Mr. BOWERS. Do I understand that the gentleman has been advised that this law lies dormant; that it is a dead letter, and that nothing is done for its enforcement?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I do not make that statement; but I do make the statement that the machinery provided in the law itself for the enforcement of the law has not been utilized and is not being utilized.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman assert that certain machinery provided for in the law is not provided? Does he not know that certain members of the police force have been detailed to this particular work, and have done it?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. No; I do not so understand.

Mr. BOWERS. Does he deny that proposition?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. No; I will not deny it, but I do say that the law provides for the appointment of two inspectors by the commissioners for a specific purpose, and that these two inspectors detailed for a specific purpose have not been appointed.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman contend that there is a provision of law that requires that appointment; and if he does, will he not admit the proposition that two members of the police force, who are inspectors and appointed for this purpose, have been designated to take care of that particular situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The act of May 28, 1908—"An act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia"—distinctly provides:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to appoint two inspectors to carry out the provisions of this act, at a compensation not exceeding \$1,200 each per annum.

Unless they are already provided in the bill, so that it will make an additional number, the appropriation would seem to be expressly authorized. The Chair thinks the amendment is in order in this bill.

Mr. MACON. Is it germane to this particular part of the bill—for the support of the court? That is the point of order I thought the gentleman was making. I make the point of order that it is not germane.

Mr. BOWERS. This very matter was raised and voted on in consideration of another stage of this bill, or at another page, and it went out on a point of order.

Mr. MACON. The objection was made because it was a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. BOWERS. Objection was made to recurring to that particular paragraph.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I take the ground that the amendment is perfectly germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania state exactly where he wants his amendment to come in?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. On page 67, after the word "dollars," in line 22, I had stated. I asked to change it to after the word "dollars" in line 20.

Mr. MACON. I object, Mr. Chairman. He would have to have unanimous consent to put it in at that point, and I insist on my point of order that it is not germane to this part of the bill. This part of the bill refers to the police court.

Mr. MANN. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that commencing with line 21, of page 66, down to and including line 7, on page 67, is all part of one proposition, of distinctive separate appropriations, which shall all be included in the \$3,200. Now, the gentleman proposes to interject between these an item containing an entirely different proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to offer it as a separate paragraph.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I offered it after the word "dollars" in line 22.

Mr. MANN. The committee had read down to line 22 on page 66.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I offer the amendment after the word "dollars," in line 22, page 67, as a separate paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer it as an amendment to the paragraph or as a new paragraph?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I offer it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman distinctly offered his amendment to this paragraph, beginning after the word "dollars" in this particular line.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I have a perfect right, Mr. Chairman, to offer it as an amendment to the paragraph or as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he withhold his amendment, because the item "Miscellaneous," which would immediately follow it, as the Chair understands, applies only to the police court. The gentleman can withhold it until the reading of line 12, on page 68.

Mr. MANN. The Chair might rule that he withhold, because if he did not withhold, the "miscellaneous" provided would provide for this office as part of the court officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is a little out of order at this time. The Chair can not take the time to read the long paragraph so as to understand the items fully, but has read far enough to learn that the caption "Miscellaneous" refers to the police court. If that is so, it would hardly be in order to insert the appropriation for two inspectors just before that caption, as that would make all the "miscellaneous" items apply to the inspectors and not to the police court, where they belong.

Mr. MANN. That is the point I made.

Mr. MACON. That is the reason I made the point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the Chair rule it out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order to the amendment, as it is not germane to the part of the bill where it is now offered.

Mr. WANGER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WANGER. Will it not be entirely in order for my colleague to offer his amendment after line 7, page 69?

The CHAIRMAN. Not until we reach that.

Mr. WANGER. He can withhold the amendment until later.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be offered at that point when it is reached and the Chair will consider it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The next vacancy occurring in the office of justice of the peace for the District of Columbia shall not be filled, and thereafter the number of justices of the peace for the District of Columbia shall not exceed five.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to offer the amendment as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 69, after line 4:

"For two inspectors to enforce the child-labor law, at \$1,200 each."

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon the paragraph. I do not know whether it is subject to it or not.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved, and the gentleman, if he chooses, may speak upon the amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BOWERS] that the work required by the child-labor law to be performed by certain inspectors is being performed by some members of the police force, who have been delegated for that purpose. I have no desire to question that statement. Coming as it does from the gentleman from Mississippi, I believe it to be true; but the law that was passed one year ago specifically provided its own police regulations, the method for its own enforcement; provided that there should be two inspectors for that purpose, and stipulated what the salary should be; and it occurs to me that Congress having determined upon a law of that character, having determined upon that method of enforcing the law, should now proceed to provide the means by which those inspectors can be employed.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the law confer upon these inspectors police powers?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Only in so far as the enforcement of the child-labor law is concerned.

Mr. MANN. I mean does it confer upon them police powers in the enforcement of the child-labor law?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Here is what the law says in relation to the matter:

That the Commissioners of the District are hereby authorized to appoint two inspectors to carry out the purposes of this act, at a compensation not exceeding \$1,200 per annum.

Mr. MANN. We both want the law enforced.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me quite manifest that it is necessary in enforcing a law of that sort for the inspectors to have police powers. The question in my mind was whether these inspectors, if appointed, would have police powers, and hence whether it would be better to provide inspectors who have not police powers or to detail policemen to do the work of inspection.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Where it becomes the express duty of certain men to enforce certain laws, there is a greater likelihood of those laws being enforced than if that duty devolves upon another set of men whose police powers are general instead of special.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I quite agree with the gentleman on the general proposition; but if, as suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BOWERS], two men now having police powers have been detailed by the commissioners to enforce the law, they have the same responsibility that they would have if they were named under the appropriation act.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman object to having these laws enforced by policemen?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes; to a certain extent.

Mr. BOWERS. Why? Does the gentleman desire to create—

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Permit me to answer the first question.

Mr. BOWERS. I will await the gentleman's answer.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I object to this extent, that I want to have men selected for the enforcement of that law whose special duty it is to see that the law is enforced in all of its parts.

Mr. BOWERS. But does not the gentleman understand that the members of the police force who are delegated for this duty are charged with this duty and no other? And may I inquire of the gentleman if in his objection to having this work done by a member of the police force, he desires to create two other officials in the machinery of the District government?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Those two other officials have already been created by law.

Mr. BOWERS. But if their duties may be discharged by policemen delegated for that purpose, does the gentleman desire further to burden the roll with two new officers, created for that purpose?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I desire that these two men shall be appointed as inspectors, not as policemen. It may be that the commissioners at the present time have appointed policemen for that purpose, and it may also be that the commissioners who are to follow them may do the same thing; but it does not follow that if appropriations are not made for that purpose, the commissioners will hereafter appoint men for that purpose.

Mr. BOWERS. But the interesting fact remains that the work is now being done, and so far as this committee is enlightened by the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it has been satisfactorily done by policemen detailed for that purpose. With the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania it will add unnecessarily two more persons to the pay roll of the District of Columbia. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. FULTON. Do these police officers who are detailed to do this work have any other duties to perform?

Mr. BOWERS. I do not know whether they do or not, but they are detailed to do this work, and while they are doing it they do not perform any other. And I may say to the gentleman that this committee, in investigating that proposition, has found that the city of Washington has more policemen to the square foot and to the number of inhabitants than any other city of similar size in the United States.

Mr. FULTON. What do they do?

Mr. BOWERS. Oh, walk about.

Mr. FULTON. What I am trying to get at is this: Does not the gentleman from Mississippi believe that the service that

will be rendered by these two appointees provided for by this amendment will be better if they do not have anything else to do except to attend to this business?

Mr. BOWERS. So long as these present policemen are about these duties I do not think they have anything else to do. Furthermore, there has not been the slightest objection made by my friend from Pennsylvania that these duties are not well performed.

Mr. FULTON. Do they detail one man to-day and another man to-morrow?

Mr. BOWERS. They detail two men for this particular purpose.

Mr. FULTON. For the entire year?

Mr. BOWERS. I do not know about that.

Mr. FULTON. Do they appoint one man to-day and another man to-morrow?

Mr. BOWERS. I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOWERS. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In regard to the question raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma, I will say to the House that when this provision was passed by the House at the last session there was no provision for compensation. In order to give the law immediate effect the commissioners detailed two policemen whom they believed to be expressly qualified for this specific work. They are limited to that work now and detailed for that particular purpose and do nothing else, and, so far as information came to the committee, there is absolutely no fault found anywhere in the administration of the law.

Mr. BOWERS. I do not think even the gentleman from Pennsylvania will suggest that the child-labor law in this District has not been properly enforced. I invite him to say whether he finds any fault with the enforcement of that law.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I have not challenged the gentleman's statement in any way or form.

Mr. BOWERS. Then it seems to me that the failure to challenge the present machinery of the administration is a sufficient answer to every objection.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Mississippi understands as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania understands that any appointment or selection that is made by the commissioners of policemen to perform this duty is merely optional with them; and if no appropriation is made by this Congress for the purpose of furnishing two inspectors, the commissioners may turn their entire attention toward policing the city in other respects and omit entirely the inspection under this child-labor law.

Mr. BOWERS. Up to this time a sufficient detail has been made to take care of this law; it has taken care of this law, and it has taken care of it efficiently, and "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Michigan makes the statement that it was simply until appropriations could be made.

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman challenge the truth of the statement that the law has been efficiently enforced? I want to know if my friend from Pennsylvania intends to suggest in the least degree that this law has not been enforced efficiently and to the letter.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I make the statement that the law has not been enforced to the letter, because of the fact that the inspectors provided for by the law have not been appointed, and that no appropriation has been made to furnish the means.

Mr. BOWERS. The gentleman is in conflict with the Commissioners of the District. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that I reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania) there were 14 ayes and 26 noes.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania demands tellers. Those in favor of tellers will rise. [After counting.] Seven gentlemen have arisen; not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 3 of the act approved March 23, 1906, which makes it the duty of the superintendent in charge of the workhouse of the District of Columbia, in which any person is confined on account of a sentence under said act, to pay out of any funds available to the persons named in said act a sum equal to 50 cents for each day's hard labor performed by said person so confined, is hereby repealed.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we will not contest the point of order, but are very glad to arrest the attention of the House for a moment in order that we may explain the situation of the committee. The committee was led to believe that increasing the appropriation from \$200 to \$2,400 was putting a premium on vagrancy, but light has come to the committee, or to some members of the committee, that makes it appear—and I will speak only for myself—that we were acting under a misapprehension. Up to January 1, \$777 had been used, and probably not more than \$1,500 will be used this year. I send forward the following amendment, which I ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio insist on the point of order?

Mr. KEIFER. I reserve the point of order if the gentleman wants to amend the paragraph, but I shall insist on the point of order as it is at present.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the proposed amendment for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 74, in lieu of the paragraph stricken out on a point of order, insert:

"For payment to the beneficiaries named in section 3 of an act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or wilfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances, approved March 23, 1906, \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be disbursed by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia on itemized vouchers duly audited and approved by the auditor of the District."

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order should be made against that amendment and also that it might be offered independent of the paragraph to which the point of order is sought to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio insist upon the point of order?

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, and I desire to be heard on the point.

Mr. BENNET of New York. But as I understand it, the gentleman from Michigan concedes the point of order.

Mr. MANN. This is a separate and independent section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, allow me to say this much in justification of making the point of order: That this provision, if in the bill when it became a law, would undertake to change the whole character of the law that was passed March 23, 1906, the object of which was to make husbands take care of their families and their wives and their minor dependent children, and to inject in here a repeal of the last section of that would be to overthrow practically the whole act, which is a good one and one such as we find generally throughout the States of the Union.

Mr. BOWERS. May I ask the gentleman to withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman reserves the point of order on that provision of the bill which repeals the existing legislation with reference to the payment of a certain sum of money to the dependent families of those who are committed to the workhouse under certain circumstances. Mr. Chairman, the committee reported this provision with a full knowledge of the fact that it would be subject to a point of order, and with the expectation that the point of order would probably be made; but the committee conceived it to be its duty to bring to the attention of the House in this way the effect of the legislation which was passed some time ago on this subject.

The provision against which this point of order is aimed repeals the law that the dependent families of those who do not support them shall be maintained out of the Public Treasury. It means simply this: That if A is arrested because of his failure to provide for his family and is committed to the workhouse by reason of that breach of the law, the Government and the District shall pay to his family or do for his family that thing which A did not do theretofore.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's statement being correct, but not quite full, I would suggest that in order to get this the man must perform hard labor.

Mr. BOWERS. I am coming to that, and I thank the gentleman "for teaching me that word," because I have had an

opportunity to inspect the hard labor that was done by A. I had the pleasure of watching some of those who were committed for violations of this particular act and of holding the watch on them for the purpose of ascertaining how long it took them to move one particular shovel of dirt.

Mr. COX of Indiana. How long did it take?

Mr. BOWERS. Well, it was not quite five minutes. I give them the benefit of the doubt. Of course I understand that this point of order is going to be insisted upon, and I know the provision is going out, but I do not want it to go out without some notice to the House of the condition of the legislation on that subject and the way in which it operates, and it is for that reason that I have asked the gentleman from Ohio to withhold his point of order. The obligation of the District and the Government to these people results from the fact that they do not obey their own obligations. No person is a beneficiary under this provision except by reason of the fact that the husband or father fails to do the thing which this law puts the burden upon the District to do. Now, we have been told it is a trifling amount, and so it is in amount, and it is by reason of the growth of this particular item that the committee has felt it wise to bring this matter to the attention of the House. When this provision was inserted in the law two years ago the appropriation suggested by the commissioners and passed was \$200. The last suggestion is \$2,000.

Mr. MANN. The appropriation last year was \$2,400, the current law is \$2,400.

Mr. BOWERS. Larger than I thought. My idea was that it was only \$2,000, and I find it is \$2,400 as against \$2,000; and I call the attention of the committee to the growth in two years from \$200 to \$2,400 and leave the question with them. I did not want that to pass without some understanding of the subject.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say a word in justification of my opposition to this provision of the bill. Under the act passed March 3, 1906, which had for its object the punishment of husbands and fathers of minor children who, for various reasons or without reasons, neglected to maintain their families, a person convicted of neglecting to maintain his wife or minor children might be fined a sum of \$500 or imprisoned, or both fined and imprisoned; and in case where such a person has been imprisoned by the judgment of the court, it is required that for every day of hard labor he performs during his sentence there shall be paid to the dependent wife or minor children, or for their benefit, 50 cents a day. This is a case where the authorities undertake to punish a man for not doing that which he might do, and while they are imprisoning him as a means of punishment still making through his own labor some compensation toward maintaining the dependent ones. It is a wise law. My friend on the committee from Mississippi thinks that the Government pays it. If the Government in the administration of the law imprisons a man and makes it impossible for him to labor to maintain his own wife and dependent minor children, the Government might well bear some burden in taking care of those people.

Mr. BOWERS. What was he doing in that regard before he goes to prison?

Mr. KEIFER. In many cases, I do not know an individual case, but in many cases he was earning money and spending it on other people and not upon his own children.

Mr. BOWERS. Does not my friend understand that the reason why he is imprisoned is because he does not support his family?

Mr. KEIFER. Undoubtedly, but while he is there, if he performs a day's labor, which may be worth \$2—

Mr. BOWERS. Or 2 cents.

Mr. KEIFER. Or if he works slowly, it may be worth a dollar, or working still slower, 50 cents; it is all to be paid to the dependent family in consequence of each day's labor.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. BOWERS. Does not the gentleman know that the superintendent of that institution says that in the cold weather, in the hard times, they break into the workhouse in order to get a comfortable home?

Mr. KEIFER. I think the gentleman is alluding to another class of people altogether—those who are generally called tramps. That is the class of people to whom the gentleman has reference; but we are dealing with the class of people who, in the judgment of the law, can and ought to maintain their families—

Mr. BOWERS. But do not.

Mr. KEIFER. And if we imprison them and punish them in order to make them do what they ought to do, we ought at

least, if they perform labor, to pay their families the small sum of 50 cents a day. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Michigan offers the amendment which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 74, in lieu of the paragraph stricken out on a point of order, insert:

"For payment to the beneficiaries named in section 3 of an act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances, approved March 23, 1906, \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be disbursed by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia on itemized vouchers duly audited and approved by the auditor of the District."

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, that is the statute as it stands, or did stand previous to the recommendation of the committee, under the appropriation, less \$400.

Mr. MANN. I want to state to the gentleman that there has been considerable talk about how rapidly this expenditure has increased. The law for the current year is \$2,400. If this rapid increase is taking place, the Government being absolutely obligated to pay this money in the end, what is the purpose of reducing the amount for the next fiscal year?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it was stated a few minutes ago that up to January \$777 of the \$2,400 had been used. The probabilities are that the ensuing months of the fiscal year will not consume as much as they have already. It was put at \$2,000 so as to cover any reasonable contingency.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the probabilities are that during the winter season the expenditure will be greater than during the mild season?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is now nearly 66 per cent of increase.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is more loafing.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] says it is because there is more loafing. I do not know. If some man, who is unable to get work and has a wife and children, is willing to go to jail in order that his wife and children may get 50 cents a day, I will take my hat off to him.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If the gentleman could see these men at work, he would not wonder they were out of a job.

Mr. MANN. It is a part of the prerogative of the gentleman to require them to work. The law says hard labor. The gentleman ought to have a provision to correct that.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Allow me to say right at that point that one of the weaknesses of the whole thing is that they are transported in the Government's carriage, with a government guard, 1, 2, 3, or 4 miles, and that they do not average but about four hours a day. It is said on good authority that a recent commissioner, when he conceived the idea, tickled himself over a new idea and went around congratulating others on the brightness of the conception.

He made a proposition to the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds that he would employ these men down on the works beyond the Washington Monument, and it was said to him:

If you will pay the guards, we will allow you to have the prisoners.

Three guards were detailed to look out for 20 prisoners. They worked three days. The engineer commissioner said:

Take off your guard and take the prisoners back to the workhouse. I am losing money.

Mr. MANN. If all the gentleman states is true, and I have no reason to doubt it, and I always accept the gentleman's word, it is an additional reason and the first real reason that I have heard for remodeling the whole system of the workhouse here, as suggested in the President's message the other day. I suppose that is what we will do, then.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, right on that point you will not find anything in the appropriations for the workhouse in improvements of any sort or kind. It is deferred until we get the report from this commission that has been appointed and which has reported since the committee completed framing the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 25392) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the gov-

ernment of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ITALIAN EARTHQUAKE DISASTER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication (S. Doc. No. 649), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

ROME, January 13, 1909.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington:

In the name of the members of the Chamber of Deputies, I beg to convey their sincere appreciation of the kind sympathy shown by you in this hour of extreme desolation for our country. It is another link that binds us more closely together in that traditional friendship that we have always felt for your chivalrous people.

PRESIDENT MARCORA.

[Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MUDD, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KEIFER, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 26203) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report (H. Rept. No. 1851), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state I do not expect to call up this bill to-morrow; but unless there is something intervening that is more important I hope to call it up the succeeding day for consideration. I wish to say that some gentlemen have spoken to me about a desire to have some general debate. I am not certain as to the number. If they will make known their wishes before then we will try to make an arrangement for short general debate.

BAY RUM.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported with amendment the bill (H. R. 22884) more completely to accomplish the objects contemplated by section 3 of the act of April 12, 1900, chapter 191, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report (H. Rept. No. 1852), ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from Hamilton, Colbert, Yerkes & Hamilton, transmitting report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator, and Railway Company for the year ended December 31, 1908 (S. Doc. No. 650)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the twenty-second annual report of the commission (H. Doc. No. 1317)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. Martin Compton against The United States (H. Doc. No. 1315)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Eleanor Maxwell against The United States (H. Doc. No. 1316)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24492) to authorize the Secretary of War to donate one condemned bronze

fieldpiece and cannon balls to the county of Orange, State of New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1845), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 476) requesting the Department of Justice to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information relative to "special agents" in its employ, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1850) which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 3766, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 486) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case for the relief of Levi Adcock, accompanied by a report (No. 1844), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 26072) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the civil war, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1846), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5268) for the relief of J. de L. Lafitte, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1847), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21881) for the relief of John D. Baldwin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1848), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24373) to reimburse Royal L. Sweany, late deputy collector of internal revenue at Tacoma, Wash., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1849), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19995) granting an increase of pension to Leonard W. Massey—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 25961) granting a pension to Alexander L. Smith—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 20838) granting an increase of pension to John A. Thomas—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN. A bill (H. R. 26062) authorizing the creation of a land district in the State of South Dakota, to be known as the "Bellevue land district"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 26063) to provide for use of water power at Dam No. 1 on White River, Arkansas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 26064) to change and fix the time for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States for the eastern and middle districts of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 26065) to provide for the further improvement of the harbor of Erie, Pa.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26066) to cause a survey to be made of Erie Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GODWIN: A bill (H. R. 26067) for the improvement of the upper Cape Fear River from Wilmington to Fayetteville,

N. C., by the construction of three locks and dams of sufficient size and strength to afford a channel 8 feet deep for continuous navigation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 26068) providing for an additional judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON: A bill (H. R. 26069) to authorize commissions to issue in the cases of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps retired with increased rank—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 26070) to provide for the deduction of hatchways and water-ballast space from the gross tonnage of vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 26071) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appraise lands in the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and grant the same to the Great Northern Railway—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 26073) to approve and ratify the construction of a bridge across the Indian River North, in the State of Florida, by the New Smyrna Bridge and Investment Company—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 26074) providing special postage rate on third-class and fourth-class matter on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 26075) to reduce the fire limits for the United States post-office building at Du Quoin, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 26076) to authorize the Secretary of War to continue and complete the deepening of the channel of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Missouri River to the city of St. Paul, Minn., and in accordance with the plan heretofore authorized and adopted, on or before July 1, 1918, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KEIFER, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 26203) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 228) to enable the States of Mississippi and Louisiana to agree upon a boundary line and to determine the jurisdiction of crimes committed on the Mississippi River and adjacent territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) to enable the States of Mississippi and Arkansas to agree upon a boundary line and to determine the jurisdiction of crimes committed on the Mississippi River and adjacent territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) to provide for the printing of 250,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Horses—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 53) directing a survey of Sabine Pass and Taylors Bayou, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Pensions: A bill (H. R. 26072) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the civil war and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 26077) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Resch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 26078) granting an increase of pension to Edward Condon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 26079) granting an increase of pension to Florence A. Scott—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEALE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 26080) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26081) granting an increase of pension to David Goodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26082) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26083) granting an increase of pension to John McCullough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26084) granting an increase of pension to Johiel Vashbinder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 26085) granting an increase of pension to Martin K. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26086) granting an increase of pension to D. W. Garmon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL (by request): A bill (H. R. 26087) granting a pension to Loise Timmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 26088) granting an increase of pension to Volkert V. Van Patten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 26089) granting an increase of pension to James H. Roundy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 26090) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Barnett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26091) granting an increase of pension to William C. Chumney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26092) granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Searcy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26093) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Yelton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26094) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Butler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26095) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Tanner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26096) granting an increase of pension to Leroy F. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26097) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Mulkey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26098) granting an increase of pension to George B. Ely—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26099) granting an increase of pension to George T. McGehee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26100) granting an increase of pension to S. J. P. McDowell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26101) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Petmecky—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26102) granting an increase of pension to Griffin Tinney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26103) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Eanes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26104) granting an increase of pension to William McComb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26105) granting an increase of pension to Merrywether W. Blackburn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26106) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Glass—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26107) granting an increase of pension to Thaddeus P. Sparks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26108) granting an increase of pension to James F. Baudy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26109) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Sparks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26110) granting an increase of pension to William A. Pitts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26111) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shaw—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26112) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ottenhouse—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26113) granting an increase of pension to David Crockett Burleson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26114) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Willie—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26115) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Bebout—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 26116) to pay Edgar F. Luckenbach for damages to his barge *C. F. Sargent* by collision with the U. S. dredge *Manhattan*—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26117) granting a pension to Sarah A. Foley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 26118) granting an increase of pension to William B. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 26119) granting an increase of pension to William J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIS: A bill (H. R. 26120) granting an increase of pension to George Byers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26121) granting an increase of pension to Israel G. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26122) for the relief of the trustees of Frying Pan Meeting House of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26123) for the relief of the estate of Samuel H. Hutchison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 26124) granting a pension to Anne Olive Erwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26125) granting an increase of pension to James F. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 26126) granting a pension to Nannie E. Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIEKEMA: A bill (H. R. 26127) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Randolph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26128) granting an increase of pension to John C. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26129) granting an increase of pension to Orlando J. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26130) granting an increase of pension to Amos E. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26131) for the relief of James Conway—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 26132) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Olmsted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 26133) granting a pension to Hannah Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 26134) granting a pension to Roger A. Sprague—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26135) granting a pension to Benjamin Wain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26136) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26137) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Furbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOELKER: A bill (H. R. 26138) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 26139) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Harrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26140) granting an increase of pension to Archibald Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 26141) for the relief of Harry Devlin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 26142) granting an increase of pension to Morgan C. Hackworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26143) granting an increase of pension to Alex B. Tadlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26144) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Cates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26145) granting an increase of pension to James Key—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26146) to correct the war record of Elijah Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 26147) granting an increase of pension to Herman Brumley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 26148) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Vedder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 26149) granting a pension to Sophia Irvine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 26150) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 26151) granting an increase of pension to William F. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 26152) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26153) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sober—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26154) granting an increase of pension to Carrier Thompson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON: A bill (H. R. 26155) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Ernst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26156) for the relief of Joseph Flewheart—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 26157) granting an increase of pension to Homer Peake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26158) granting an increase of pension to William E. Bybee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26159) for the relief of David S. Bradley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 26160) granting an increase of pension to George R. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26161) granting an increase of pension to William C. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26162) granting an increase of pension to Peter Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 26163) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Hull Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26164) granting an increase of pension to Gardner L. Chace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26165) granting an increase of pension to Milo Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 26166) for the relief of E. G. Spillman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26167) for the relief of R. A. Cameron—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26168) for the relief of A. R. Museller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26169) for the relief of Emory D. Brownlee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26170) for the relief of John J. Boles—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26171) for the relief of Alfred H. Boles—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26172) for the relief of James B. Cullison—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26173) granting an increase of pension to John W. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 26174) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 26175) granting a pension to Malcolm H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26176) granting a pension to John Eckerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 26177) for the relief of W. T. Kinkaide, alias Kincade—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 26178) granting an increase of pension to John Dempsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 26179) granting an increase of pension to John Bedheimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 26180) granting an increase of pension to David L. Pitcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 26181) for the relief of the heirs of John G. Freeman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 26182) granting an increase of pension to James B. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 26183) granting an increase of pension to Reuben R. Garrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 26184) granting an increase of pension to Henry Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 26185) granting a pension to Annie Estes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26186) granting a pension to Mary McJenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26187) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 26188) granting a pension to John J. Neigert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 26189) granting an increase of pension to James M. Slown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26190) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Cherry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26191) granting a pension to William E. Gilchrist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 26192) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Seaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26193) granting an increase of pension to Owen O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWASEY: A bill (H. R. 26194) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Chauncey M. Allard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26195) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Francis G. French, alias Frank Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26196) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frederick W. Buck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26197) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John H. Rollins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 26198) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 26199) granting an increase of pension to Melius J. Nelson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26200) granting an increase of pension to Elias G. Pike—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 26201) granting an increase of pension to Agnes J. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26202) granting a pension to Eliza Girvan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: Resolution (H. Res. 486) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 3766—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 487) to pay Matthew Davison, jr., David J. Berger, and Patrick J. Goode certain sums of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petitions of Mantua Grange and of other societies and individuals in New Jersey and other States, for parcels post on rural delivery routes and a postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Dearborn Chemical Works Company, of Chicago, Ill., praying for legislation relating to the operation of railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Rear-Admiral H. F. Picking Naval Garrison, No. 4, of Erie, Pa., praying for legislation relating to the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the St. Cloud (Minn.) Trades and Labor Council, protesting against the sentencing of Messrs. Gompers, Mitchell, and Morrison in the federal court of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Negro Business League, praying for an appropriation to reimburse the depositors of the late Freedman's Savings and Trust Company—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for an increase in the salaries of federal judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Saengerbund of the Northwest, protesting against the prohibition of the liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Saengerbund of the Northwest, protesting against the alteration in section 3893 of the Revised Federal Statutes, relating to the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, praying for various improvements of California rivers and harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Central Federated Union of New York, protesting against legislation for the establishment of compulsory arbitration—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the commercial organizations of Humboldt County, Cal., urging the improvement of Humboldt Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Synod of California, praying for legislation to prevent Sunday banking in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of W. L. Penney and 18 others, citizens of Walpole, Mass., praying for national cooperation in technical education—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Synod of Ohio of the Presbyterian Church, praying for legislation to prevent Sunday banking in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Synod of California, praying for the enactment of a law requiring individuals and corporations engaged in interstate commerce to give each of their employees who work on Sunday a full 24-hour rest day—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of American citizens residing in the Isle of Pines, praying for the Government of the United States to secure to them such a government as shall protect them in the proper enjoyment of their property, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Synod of Ohio of the Presbyterian Church, praying for the enactment of legislation requiring individuals and corporations engaged in interstate commerce to give each of their employees who work on Sunday a full 24-hour rest day—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of D. B. Dearborn, of New York, praying for legislation to provide for the transportation by sea of material and equipment for use in the construction of the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. Annie Beenk and 16 other citizens, praying for the submission of a constitutional amendment to enable women to vote—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the American Prison Association, praying for encouragement and for national help to assist in the International Prison Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the California State Board of Trade, praying for legislation to provide for the construction of jetties and for the improvement of Humboldt Bay, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of various councils of the Knights of Columbus, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that the anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus may be made a legal holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of B. L. Duryea, of Jersey City, N. J., and other firms and individuals of the United States, praying for the reduction and removal of the duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of National Guard Association of Pennsylvania, favoring S. 2671, increasing number of army officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., against passage of Senate bill 3940—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Nineveh Grange, No. 1500, of Tuscarawas, Ohio, for parcels-post and postal savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Garrett H. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 25177) for relief of Robert Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Petition of merchants of Greene, Iowa favoring a parcels-post and postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Iowa, against passage of Senate bill 3940—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Petition of citizens of Randolph County, Ark., against passage of Senate bill 3940 (Johnston Sunday law)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of National Guard Association of Pennsylvania, favoring Senate bill 2671, for increase in number of army officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Westminster, Md., favoring the Lafean bill (H. R. 22339), for Lincoln memorial highway from Washington to Gettysburg—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Epping Carpenter Company, favoring legislation to secure carload rates on less than carload shipments—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of citizens of State of Maine, and Silver Harvest Grange, favoring a parcels-post and savings-bank law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Portland (Me.) Wholesale Merchants' Association, favoring H. R. 13266, relative to the national bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of Federation of Jewish Organizations of New York City, favoring appointment of chaplains in the army and navy for Jewish soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of citizens of Avondale, Pa., for parcels-post and postal savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Margaret A. Fay and John Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ingeborg Moeller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of William A. Kapperman, of Brooklyn, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Prison Association, for appropriation to assist work of the International Prison Commission—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition in favor of H. R. 19250, civil-war volunteer officers' retired bill (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Fryling Pan meeting house, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Jerry Hughes (H. R. 16997), heirs of Andrew Seitz, and estate of Samuel H. Hutchinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Pharmaceutical Association, against passage of H. R. 21982, relative to transportation of habit-forming and poisonous drugs in interstate and foreign commerce, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the D. B. Morrison Company and J. L. Green, of Morrilton, Fla., against removal of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pensacola Bar Association, favoring H. R. 22279, increasing judges' salaries—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fernandina Board of Trade, favoring Cumberland Sound as a harbor of naval rendezvous and port of refuge—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of National Hardware Association, for parcels post on rural free-delivery routes and for postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Escambia County Medical Society, favoring consolidation of all government bureaus or departments relative to the public health—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William R. Achenback and others, citizens of Florida, against S. 3940 (Sunday observance in the District of Columbia)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Frank E. Reeder, mayor, and others, citizens of Welaka, favoring H. R. 18204—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Gadsden County Tobacco Company, against any reduction of the import duty now levied on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of Ann Olive Erwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James F. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the Littlefield bill, designed to protect prohibition territory against liquor traffic through interstate commerce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Asiatic Exclusion League of San Francisco, favoring an exclusion law against all Asiatics save merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of citizens of various cities in Illinois, against passage of Senate bill 3940—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of National Guard Association of Pennsylvania, favoring S. 2671, authorizing extra officers for the army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Westminster, Md., favoring the Lafean bill (H. R. 22339), for Lincoln memorial highway from Washington to Gettysburg—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Epping Carpenter Company, favoring legislation to secure carload rates on less than carload shipments—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of Providence Society for Organizing Charity, for suitable appropriation for entertainment of the Congress of the International Prison Commission—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rhode Island Bar Association, favoring S. 6973, to increase salaries of United States circuit and district court judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federation of Jewish Organizations, for appointment of a chaplain in the army and navy for promotion of comfort and well-being of Jewish soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of citizens of Clyde, N. Dak., against a parcels post and a postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HALE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Key—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of citizens of Allegan County, Mich., against postal savings banks and parcels-post laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of citizens of Gatesville, Tex., against parcels-post and postal savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Papers to accompany bills for relief of John T. Johnson (H. R. 24711) and Augustus W. Patterson (H. R. 26014)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Carrier Thompson, Elizabeth Sober, and Thomas B. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: Petition of Lincoln Grange, No. 136, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring parcels-post system and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Maxwell, Iowa, against parcels-post and postal savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KIMBALL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Burnes (H. R. 24815)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of Loraine Grange, No. 117, of New York, favoring parcels-post and postal savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LEWIS: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Milo Parker, Gardner L. Chace, and Jerome Hull Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petitions of citizens of St. Cloud and Avon, Minn., against Johnston Sunday bill (S. 3940)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Modern Language Association of America, for removal of tariff from works of art and their reproductions, including photographs, all books printed in foreign countries, and scientific instruments—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. T. Kinkaid—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Annie B. Miller (H. R. 24733)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of G. F. Wheaton and others, favoring a parcels-post and postal savings banks bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Ontario and Williamson, N. Y., favoring parcels-post and savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Mount Savage Grange, No. 34, of Mount Savage, Md., favoring H. R. 18204, known as the "Davis bill"—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of merchants of Midland, Lonaconing, West-ernport, Luke, and Barton, Md., against a parcels-post system and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POLLARD: Petition of Plattsmouth Commercial Club favoring the issue of \$510,000,000 of bonds for internal-waterway improvements—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of Norfolk Commercial Club and Omaha Real Estate Exchange, favoring increased pay for railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of Bethany Grange, No. 748, of Genesee County, N. Y., against parcels-post delivery on rural free-delivery routes and for postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of Butte Miners' Union, of Butte, Mont., favoring legal investigation of the Treadwell Mining Company—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Misses M. E. and S. J. Geadney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George H. Preddy (H. R. 26044)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWASEY: Petitions of citizens of Damariscotta, Bryant Pond, Strong, Wilton, and North Waterford, Me., favoring establishment of postal savings banks and a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petition of citizens of Minnesota, favoring a parcels-post law and postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Chautauqua Grange, No. 571, Patrons of Husbandry, for parcels-post and postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of National Print Cutters' Association, against removal of tariff on wall paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Zinke Mercantile Company, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Bar Association, favoring increase of salaries of United States circuit and district court judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the executive committee of the Prison Association of New York, praying for an appropriation in aid of the International Prison Congress to be held in Washington, D. C., in 1910—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of shoe dealers of Milwaukee, for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Federation of Jewish Organizations, for appointment of chaplain in army and navy of the Jewish faith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 14, 1909.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

ELECTORAL VOTE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, authenticated copies of the certification of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice-President appointed in the States of Kentucky and Tennessee, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to be filed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of Sarah C. Mitchell, executrix of Richard T. Mitchell, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 655); and

In the cause of William H. Staubs, administrator of Ely Moats, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 654).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. C. R. McKenney, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 216) for a special Lincoln postage stamp, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of Piscataqua Harbor, No. 83, American Association of Master Mates and Pilots, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called "Knox bill" concerning licensed officers of steam and sail vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1117, Patrons of Husbandry, of Danbury, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Auburn, N. Y., and the memorial of J. G. Coultant, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation inimical to the railroad interests of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Local Grange of Williamson; of Local Grange No. 117, of Lorraine; of Local Grange No. 817, of West Henrietta; of Local Grange of Ontario; of Chautauqua Grange, No. 571, of Mayville; of Ross Grange, No. 305, of Elliott; and of Leyden Grange, No. 562, of Talcottville, Patrons

of Husbandry, all in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maine, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SCOTT presented the petition of J. C. Way, of Sistrerville, W. Va., and the petition of David T. Peterson, of Weston, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a volunteer retired list in the War and Navy departments for the surviving officers of the civil war, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DEPEW presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Auburn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation inimical to the railroad interests of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of the Real Estate Exchange, of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation granting travel pay to railway clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. RAYNER presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BULKELEY presented petitions of Local Grange No. 124, of Higganum; of Wolf Den Grange, No. 61, of Pomfret Center; of Local Grange No. 82, of Colebrook; of Local Grange No. 143, of Goshen; and of Local Grange No. 54, of Plainville, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McLAURIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8260) providing for the erection of a coal shed on the light-house wharf at Humboldt Bay, California, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 747) thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8261) providing for the remodeling and reconstruction of the light tower and keeper's dwellings at Alcatraz Island, Bay of San Francisco, California, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 748) thereon.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7882) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a road and two bridges on the Warm Springs Reservation, Oreg., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 749) thereon.

Mr. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8306) to amend the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. L., p. 876) entitled "An act making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 750) thereon.

Mr. DICK, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 10416) to correct the naval record of Lieut. Hilary Williams, U. S. Navy (Report No. 751);

A bill (H. R. 16927) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Kenneth McAlpine (Report No. 752); and

A bill (H. R. 7807) to place John Crowley on the retired list of the United States Navy (Report No. 753).

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7914) to amend sections 7 and 8 of the act of May 29, 1908 (35 Stat. L., p. 460) entitled "An act to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian reservations, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 764) thereon.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8243) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve power sites on the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, submitted an adverse report (No. 754) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.